

THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. XL.

APRIL, 1859.

ARTICLE I.

THE THREE SAXON ELECTORS OF THE ERA OF THE REFORMATION.

No. III.

By Charles F. Schaeffer, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

JOHN THE CONSTANT.—PART II.

WE had commenced a biographical sketch of this eminent man in a former number of the *Evangelical Review*, (July, 1858, p. 36 sqq.) but the space allotted to such articles did not allow us to complete it. At the request of several readers of the *Review*, we now resume our task.*

A sketch of the life of John of Saxony, as *the first Protestant*—the first in the order of time, who bears that name in history—could not be easily prepared, without becoming really a history of the Augsburg Confession, from its appa-

* The writer of this article must apologize for the slender amount of strictly biographical matter which it contains. At the period in the history of the elector John, which we have here reached, his position as a *Protestant* far exceeded in importance every other circumstance with which his name is connected. We were thus unavoidably led to explain his real position with a certain degree of minuteness, and hence were required to consider a question which seems to be entirely overlooked by large numbers of Lutherans in this country, namely: Which of the twenty-eight articles composing the Augsburg Confession are, distinctively and essentially *THE PROTESTANT OR LUTHERAN ARTICLES*, as contradistinguished from the popish system? If the correctness of the view which we here submit to the reader has been substantiated by us, the rank which a genuine Protestant will assign to the last seven articles, can be easily determined.

rent germs at the Marburg Colloquium to its presentation in a fully developed form at the diet of Augsburg. Indistinct views respecting the true character and design of this Symbol or Confession of faith, as well as of the relative importance of the twenty-eight articles essentially belonging to it, are often entertained and expressed, which lead to many practical errors. These inconveniences may be obviated by examining the subject in the light of history—by tracing this remarkable production to its original sources, and observing the events and the men, on the one hand, whose history is connected with its origin, and, on the other, the controlling influence which these events and these men respectively exercised in giving it a peculiar character and shape. We may possibly be enabled, by such a procedure, to understand its spirit and design more accurately, and also to determine with precision the relation which its two constituent parts or sets of articles—respectively, *twenty-one* and *seven* in number—sustain to each other. The more remote influences which produced the Augsburg Confession, such as the peculiar position assigned by Divine Providence to John, in aiding the great work for which Luther had received a commission from heaven, and also the relations which existed between these personages, on the one hand, and Philip of Hesse and Zwingli on the other, have been already partially described in our last number. After having thus disposed of that branch of the subject, we propose, in the present article, to describe historically the *immediate* influences which led to the composition of the entire *twenty-eight* articles of the Augsburg Confession. The circumstances to which we here allude, belong essentially to the history of John the Constant.

THE DIET OF SPIRES* OF 1526.

The cause of the Reformation had received a new impulse in Germany, when John acquired by inheritance the electoral dignity, after the decease of his brother Frederic, May 5,

* The cities and towns mentioned in this article, and situated chiefly in the central and southern parts of the old German Empire, after being on various occasions transferred from one government to another, are now assigned respectively to the following territories: *Augsburg*, *Spires* and *Nuremberg* which were formerly free or imperial cities, now belong, together with *Schwabach*, to Bavaria. *Torgau*, on the Elbe, belongs to Prussia. *Schmalkalden*, a town in Hesse Cassel, is situated at the confluence of the *Schmalkalde* and *Stille*. *Marburg*, in the same principality, is on the river *Lahn*, and is to be distinguished from another *Marburg* in the Austrian dominions. *Coburg*, the capital of the princi-

1525. The hostility which existed between Pope Clement VII. and the emperor Charles V., and their military operations so completely occupied their attention, that the evangelical party was not seriously molested. The members of the latter, the elector John, Philip of Hesse, &c., had not, however, neglected to adopt proper precautions in reference to any hostile demonstrations which might at any moment be made on the part of the Papists. In the Spring of 1526, when the emperor's prospects seemed to grow brighter, and he had released Francis I. from captivity, (March 16) he found more leisure to attend to the internal affairs of the empire; he addressed, March 23, an official document to several Catholic princes, in which he highly commended the anti-Lutheran alliance already formed by them; he urged them so earnestly to sustain the popish faith, that Duke George of Saxony allowed himself to entertain the hope of wresting the electorate, with the emperor's aid, from the hands of his cousin John. (Ranke: *Deutsche Gesch.* II. 280. The documentary evidence which this eminent writer furnishes, has shed new light on the history of the Reformation.) At this period the evangelical party had also formed an alliance, (the Torgau alliance) which was first planned in Gotha, then ratified in Torgau, fully sanctioned towards the close of February, 1526, and subsequently (June 12) confirmed and signed at Magdeburg. While all the parties were in this state of suspense, the day appointed for the Diet of Spire arrived—June 25. The position of the emperor, however, whose restless enemies, Francis and Clement, had resumed their hostile projects against him, had suddenly again become very critical, and the influence of the change was instantly felt at the Diet. The baffled papists, who had expected to enforce at this Diet, the Edict of Worms, which outlawed Luther and his friends, were compelled to curb their intolerant and persecuting spirit. In our former article (Vol. X. 46) in which we furnished a few details, we mentioned that the *Recess* or final decree which was adopted by this diet, and which was regular and legal in all its forms, virtually granted the evangelical princes and cities full liberty to continue the work of the Reformation in their respective territories. *In this decree lay the first germ of Protestantism.* A "compact evan-

gality of Coburg, on the Itz, is in Central Germany. The old castle in which Luther found a temporary abode, is on a height overlooking the town. *Schleiz* belongs to one of the minor branches of the modern Saxon house.

gical party" now existed, which owed its birth to the hostile movements of the enemies of the truth. (Ranke II. 283.)

THE DIET OF SPIRES, FEBRUARY, 1529.

After the conclusion of that Diet, hostilities between the pope and emperor were renewed with increased vigor. On May 6, 1527, the imperial troops, consisting chiefly of Spaniards and Germans, had assaulted the "eternal city," and the celebrated "Sack of Rome" occurred. At the close of this Italian war, the authority of Charles was permanently established in Italy, the French were humbled, the pope remained powerless, and Charles held all Italy between the Alps and the sea, in subjection to his victorious arms. Ferdinand, the emperor's brother, was equally fortunate in enforcing his claims on the thrones of Bohemia and Hungary, and both his diplomatic and his warlike movements were crowned with brilliant success. The Bohemians, on the one hand, who were no longer blind partisans of Rome, compared the bigoted attachment to popery of Duke William of Bavaria, who aspired to the crown of Bohemia, with Ferdinand's politic assurances that he would recognize and protect the Utraquists (also termed Calixtines, one of the parties adopting the reforms of Huss;) the result was that they rejected William and elected the latter as their king; he was crowned in Prague, February 24, 1527. On the other hand, the adherents of Zapolya, who had been elected and crowned as king of Hungary, November 11, 1526, were strict papists, and had already adopted a resolution in 1525 that every Lutheran in their territory should be burned alive. When Ferdinand appeared among these, he changed his tactics; he adroitly assumed the character of a rigid Catholic, sternly repelled the charge that he had selected none but Germans as the attendants of his consort, and that all these were Lutherans, (*dedit ei Germanos qui omnes fuerunt Lutherani*—was the charge, Ranke II. 341) and thus finally secured their favor. His troops defeated Zapolya in an engagement near Tokay; the latter was expelled from the country, and on November 3, 1527, Ferdinand was crowned king of Hungary in Stuhlweissenburg, the fortress of which John the Constant had assisted in taking, thirty-seven years previously, as we remarked in the former article. (Ranke gives an interesting sketch of Ferdinand's policy, and of the events which terminated in his acquisition of the two crowns, in Vol. II. Book IV. Chap. 4.)

While the political affairs of the imperial house were assuming a favorable character, a dark cloud arose in another direction, the shadow of which appalled the hearts of the evangelical party. Philip of Hesse had contracted an intimate union with Otto Pack, to whose alleged revelations of a popish plot we referred in the last article. The former, roused by Pack's alarming statements of a secret alliance which the Catholic princes had formed, for the purpose of dividing among themselves by force of arms, the territories of John and Philip, and of extirpating the Lutherans, redoubled his efforts to strengthen the political union of his own friends. He had already sent Dr. Walter to the king of France, for the purpose of securing his aid against the emperor, and now commissioned Pack to visit Zapolya, another papist, for a similar purpose. (Ranke III. 30) Zapolya, with whom the king of France and the pope had formed an alliance, promised to furnish Philip with a large amount of money, in order to enable him to direct his arms against Ferdinand with vigor. In the meantime, Philip occupied the territories of the bishop of Wurzburg with his forces, and threatened those of the neighboring bishops of Mayence and Bamberg. The truth of Pack's disclosures was not satisfactorily proved, and he subsequently perished miserably. But he had involved Philip in a rash enterprise, of which the latter afterwards confessed that he was ashamed, and had prompted him to commit the grave offence of violating the peace of the empire by an unauthorized appeal to arms. The blemish which thus seemed to adhere to the entire evangelical party, was painfully felt by all of its members (Ranke III. 39, 118). The whole occurrence made a very unfavorable impression on Luther's mind; the latter freely conceded that a right of self-defence existed, but that it was inconsistent with the spirit of the Prince of peace to commence an offensive war. "They that take the sword," he repeated, "shall perish with the sword," (Matt. 26: 52). His letters on the subject are in de Wette's collection, III. 316—321.

The emperor's difficulties with his foreign enemies, on the other hand, had all been adjusted, or were rapidly disappearing. He concluded a peace with the pope, June 29, 1529, and soon afterwards (in August at Cambray) with Francis I.; the concurrence of Henry VIII. of England was also secured. The displeasure with which he had beheld the progress of the friends of the Reformation, to whom he now directed his attention, was at once openly proclaimed. At this period, the

beginning of the year 1528, "his policy," says Lindner, II. 73 sq., "assumed a decidedly anti-evangelical character, to which Philip's covetous glances at the imperial throne (Kaiserideen) unquestionably contributed not a little." His own early education, moreover, and general habits of thought, his apparent temporal interests and other influences (which the historian Ranke sketches with the pen of a philosopher, Book. V. Ch. 4) combined to lead him to the adoption of measures that contemplated the total extirpation of the faith which was denominated the "Lutheran heresy." On Nov. 29, 1528, an imperial proclamation was issued, directing that a Diet should be held at Spire on February 21 of the following year; it announced in the most emphatic terms that, besides the discussion of the subject of a proposed Turkish war, and of the recent violation of the public peace, effectual measures would then be adopted, in order to adjust the great religious question of the day. The members of the Diet assembled in large numbers at the appointed time, and it appeared that the Catholic party had secured a decisive majority of votes; Duke Henry of Mecklenburg and the Elector of the Palatinate, hitherto supposed to be friends of the Reformation, now acted with the Papists. The "Proposition" which the imperial commissioners offered, (March 15) while it promised a Church Council, to which the pope had ultimately consented, involved the following essential points: it expressly repealed or annulled the Recess or decree of the diet of 1526 (see the last article, p. 47) which legalized the ecclesiastical reforms of John and his associates (Kais. Maj. hebt angezeigten Artikel auf, cassirt und vernichtet denselben, &c. Ranke III. 120, n. 1), presented a substitute that was diametrically opposed to it, and extinguished completely the right of the evangelical princes and imperial cities to continue the work of the Reformation. This proposition was placed in the hands of a committee, containing a large majority of Papists, with instructions to present a report on it to the Diet. They submitted their report March 24; it recommended the adoption of the proposition of the imperial commissioners, with several amendments, conceived in the same persecuting spirit: one of them expressly sanctioned anew the Edict of Worms of 1521, which had outlawed Luther (for which see the last article, p. 44). The report of this committee was adopted at the sessions of April 6 and 7, in all its details, precisely in the form in which it was presented. Thus the Edict of Worms was revived, and the ju-

risdiction of the popish bishops in every place was restored. Tolerance was only temporarily granted to the new ecclesiastical order established in the electoral and allied dominions by the Lutherans, that is, only until a general Council should be held; but all further changes, such as the Diet of Spire of 1526 had allowed, in view of the principle of territorial sovereignty, were sternly forbidden. The Zwinglians and all others (Anabaptists, &c.) without exception, who were not identified with the Lutherans, were expressly excluded from the enjoyment of the peace of the empire. This harsh measure, which outlawed the Swiss Reformers, a party entirely distinct from Luther and the elector John, originated in the political alliance which the popish Swiss cantons had previously formed with Ferdinand (Ranke III. 122. Lindner II. 75). The cause of the evangelical religion was thus apparently crushed by a single blow; the avowed object of the extreme measures adopted by the Diet, was obviously the annihilation of Lutheranism.

A crisis had arrived. If John and his associates had faltered, the cause of evangelical truth would, humanly speaking, have been entirely prostrated; it was indeed a struggle between the Gospel and the powers of darkness; an indirect renewal of the awful scene at the commencement of the Savior's ministry, when Satan, veiling his real purpose, attempted to seduce Him in whom "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." The circumstances alone are changed—the servants of Christ are now struggling with those whom the god of this world had "taken captive at his will." The former are found to be faithful—their Master is present to guide and strengthen them. John addresses the throne of grace; Luther, God's chosen instrument, the man of faith and prayer, is guided by the Spirit of his divine Master in the instructions and inspiring letters which he transmits to John. It was decided that the evangelical party should present to the Diet a remonstrance for which Luther furnished the materials. This document (*Bedenken*) is given by de Wette III. 438 sqq. The latter could not decide on its precise date, and hence specifies simply: *Mitte Aprils*. It must have been written between the seventh and twelfth of April, as on the latter day Minkwitz declared in the presence of the diet that the evangelical party could not acquiesce in the action of the diet, for reasons which he gives (Ranke III. 124) and which coincide with those advanced by Luther. For the latter furnishes, in this written opinion, five reasons for ad-

hering to the reformation of ecclesiastical abuses, as accomplished in the electorate and elsewhere. It deserves special notice, as foreshadowing the precise purport of the Augsburg Confession that, as the report of the committee referred chiefly to popish practices of the church, which it was designed to perpetuate, Luther terms all these "abuses" (*Missbräuche*), and declares that they constitute the immediate difficulty with the papists; it is, at the same time, obvious, that these *abuses* originated partly in the suppression of divine truth, and partly in the admixture of false doctrines with the truth. That these "abuses" (oppressive exactions, perversion of ecclesiastical patronage, substitution of human devices for scriptural duties, &c.) such as the last seven articles of the Augsburg Confession describe, chiefly attracted attention at this precise moment, is also apparent from the circumstance that Luther refers in this document to the celebrated *Centum gravamina* or list of one hundred grievances; this singular catalogue had been presented in 1521 at the Diet of Worms by papists themselves, who felt the burden to be intolerable, before Luther's doctrine was proclaimed, (as he himself here remarks) but who did not perceive, as he was enabled to do, that these evils originated in the perversion of sound Gospel doctrine, and the substitution of Pelagian and kindred heresies.* He now declares that John cannot lawfully assent to the action of this diet, for the following reasons: 1.) *That action is a violation of John's rights of conscience, and hostile to wholesome Christian doctrine.* 2.) An assent to it would make John a partaker of other men's sins. 3.) John has no authority to compel a restoration of these "abuses," as the diet required of him. 4.) Such assent would be inconsistent with the proceedings of the diet of Worms of 1521, when the emperor himself confessed that the one hundred grievances needed correction, and promised to abate them. 5.) That no valid reason can be given for the action of the present diet; "his Imperial Majesty," says Luther with great force, "may learn that your Electoral Grace has not been guilty of un-

* Here lies the secret of the success of the Lutheran Reformation. It corrected the abuses mentioned in the Augsburg Confession, as well as others, not simply because they were external evils, but because they practically denied one or the other of the two fundamental principles on which the Lutheran church is established: first, the Word of God as the only rule of faith and practice (in opposition to tradition, decrees of councils, popes, &c.), and, secondly, Justification by faith in Christ alone (in opposition to all human devices for acquiring merit.) This is the spirit of the Lutheran creed—by the blessing of God it prevailed.

christian conduct, from the circumstance that the estates of the empire have not condemned your doctrine, but only referred it to a church council; now they would not have refrained from such a condemnatory course, if they had really believed your doctrine to be at variance with the Christian faith." Sustained by such a decision, John urged the Diet to abstain from sanctioning the report of the committee, and entreated the members to await the action of the promised Council. The remonstrance was signed by himself and the other evangelical princes, and presented by the landgrave Philip. It did not, however, produce an impression on the majority. On the 12th of April Minkwitz, the Saxon deputy, whom we mentioned above, reiterated the sentiments expressed in the remonstrance, and adverted very appositely to the fact that it was indecorous in a political body, such as they constituted, to decide questions involving the faith and religious liberty of Christian men, and intolerable that they should virtually anticipate the action of the proposed church council. He employed all the resources of his eloquence to secure a peaceful adjustment of the difficulty, and seems to have delivered a brilliant speech, characterized both by a sincere love of peace, and by a calm determination not to swerve for an instant from the plain path of duty.

The minority had at this point of time formed clear views of their position, both in its political and its religious aspects, and were resolved to maintain it firmly. They regarded the former decree or recess of the diet of 1526, which conceded to them the enjoyment of liberty of conscience and of their political rights, as a contract solemnly ratified at a critical period of the empire, by two distinctly defined parties—a contract which neither party was at liberty to annul without the consent of the other. This view was founded on the fact that the decree of 1526 recognized the sovereignty or independent territorial rights of the Lutheran princes and cities, and was thus virtually a recognition of a fundamental law of the empire, legitimately applied in a new case, that is, it was a legal and irreversible decision that the political rights of the Lutheran princes secured to them liberty of conscience. Now this action of the diet, on the other hand, which directly assailed their rights of conscience, at the same time practically abolished their political rights, and, in reality, subverted the whole structure of the German Empire. The circumstance that their opponents commanded at the moment a majority

of votes, could not legalize an act of that party which invaded the acknowledged political, that is, the constitutional and established rights of the minority. For if this principle were admitted, an accidental majority could at any time subvert acknowledged rights, and the sacred character of covenants, order, justice, property, life and liberty throughout Christendom might be involved in one common ruin. In a strictly legal point of view, the minority could unquestionably refuse, for such reasons, to yield obedience to the action of the majority; the latter could, with no sanction of divine or human laws, rob the minority of their natural and inalienable rights.

Such general views, which seem to have been first developed by the landgrave Philip, were now expressed by him, and by John, as well as by George, margrave of Brandenburg, Dukes Ernest and Francis of Brunswick-Lunenbourg, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt and the representatives of several free cities. But the majority was inexorable. Its constituent members, in the spirit of the Babylonian despot, adhered to the ungodly terms which they proposed: Worship the golden image—or—enter the burning fiery furnace. On the 19th of April, king Ferdinand, attended by Walldkirch and the other imperial commissioners, appeared at the Diet for the purpose of declaring it to be adjourned *sine die*, as soon as the decrees now passed, had been engrossed in the regular form of a *Recess* (Abschied); they expressed their thanks for "the devout, faithful and diligent services" of the members, and gave the imperial sanction and confirmation of the resolutions adopted, which formality constituted the latter laws of the empire. When John and his associates repeated their remonstrances, the imperial party haughtily replied that they *must* abide by the decision of the Diet, as it had, "according to the established and venerable custom, been made by the majority." The moments were precious—religious and civil liberty was ready to expire—if this outrage were silently endured, and the decrees of the Diet, in the form of a recess, were once deposited, with general consent, in the archives of the empire, not only would liberty have ceased to exist, but the Word of God would be disowned and its light extinguished. John and his friends rapidly passed into an adjoining chamber, for the purpose of preparing an answer, but Ferdinand, who was aware of their design, refused to wait, although entreated to remain. After repeating, in a still more contemptuous manner, that the said decrees were

now established laws of the empire, he withdrew at once, accompanied by the imperial commissioners. This abrupt departure, on the one hand, which in its mode and spirit, was felt to be highly derogatory to the dignity of princes of the elevated rank of John and his friends, and their deep conviction, on the other, that their political existence, and their religious rights would be annihilated, if they tacitly submitted, now determined them to resort to the last legal and pacific measure of self-defence which remained; they had already had it in contemplation during several weeks, in case the action of the Diet, as they partially apprehended, should be unfavorable. They accordingly resorted to the right of Protest and Appeal. They hastily prepared a solemn PROTEST or PROTESTATION,* which was at once presented and read at the same session of the Diet, very soon after Ferdinand's departure, but in the presence of the estates of the empire, who were still assembled. (Very soon afterwards John issued a proclamation addressed to the nation, in which he gives an extract from his Protestation; the former is omitted in the Wittenberg and Jena editions of Luther's works, but we find it in the Altenb. ed. IV. 799.) It was the Protestation now described, as presented at Spire, April 19, 1529, by John and other Lutherans, that furnished us with the word *Protestant*. In its historical meaning, it designated originally the Lutherans exclusively, as contradistinguished alike from the Reformed and the Catholics. It seems to have been applied to them officially, first of all by Cardinal Contarini (Guericke: Ch. H. III. 163) at the Colloquium of Ratisbon, April and May 1541; it was not extended to the Reformed and non-Catholics generally, until after the Peace of Westphalia of 1648. In a dogmatic or doctrinal sense, the word

* This latter form, which is the one employed by John, is probably, as an English word, the more correct of the two. The document was not so much, in the modern sense of the word, a "protest against" certain acts, as, rather, a *solemn declaration of opinion and of dissent*, vindicating rights that had been violated. The term occurs in the document in the following connection:—"We, therefore, protest publicly before God, our Creator, &c., that, in all matters which are against God and his Word, or our own salvation and conscience, or against the decree of the former diet of Spire, we refuse our consent and agreement, and hold such matters to be null and void, of no binding authority, &c." Seckendorf, Germ. p. 944. The word "*Protestatio*" in this sense, is a technical law term, not of classic authors, but of writers on civil law as early as the days of Ulpian, at the beginning of the third century. History and analogy seem alike to decide that the accent should be placed on the second syllable of the English word *Protestant*.

seems to imply the rejection of only popish errors, and even of these only indefinitely, without indicating in a direct manner the rich treasure of positive divine truth set forth in the symbols of the Lutheran church; hence we may the less reluctantly abandon it to the use of non-Catholics generally.

The Protestation rehearsed the same objections which, as we stated above, had been made when the committee reported to the Diet; it renewed the declaration that the action of said Diet, which violated a lawful contract, was itself, for that very reason, illegal, and it announced the intention of the Protestants to disregard entirely the decision of the diet, and to continue the work of the Reformation, in so far as, in the language of the former diet of Spires (see last article, p. 47) they could hope and expect "to answer for the same to God and His Imperial Majesty." Reference was also made to the ungenerous treatment by the Papists of the Zwinglians, who were condemned without a hearing.

A detailed statement of all the grievances of these Protestants was at length completed on the 25th of April, in a regular and legal form. It assumed the character of an *Appel* to the emperor, to the next General Church Council, or to the representatives of the entire German nation organized as a National Assembly. This document, which was termed their "Appellation," and which is to be carefully distinguished from the "Protestation," was signed by the Lutheran princes and the representatives of fourteen imperial cities. The Protestant party now assumed a distinctively defined attitude; its military resources were considerable, and its posture began to alarm the adherents of Popery seriously, while it emboldened the friends of divine truth to persevere in the work of Reformation. During all these exciting transactions, the elector John and Luther, both of whom God wonderfully supported, while they boldly defied alike the papal and the imperial power, infused life and energy into the bosoms of their friends, and directed and sustained the whole movement.*

* Various expressions of the apostle Paul, e. g. 2 Cor. 4: 16, indicate that while his spirit never quailed, inasmuch as "the life which he lived in the flesh, he lived by the faith of the Son of God" (Gal. 2: 20), his physical organization, disturbed and exhausted by perpetual conflicts, as well as by the "care of the churches" (2 Cor. 11: 28) at all times admonished him that he should not be "exalted above measure"—it was indeed in his weakness that the divine strength imparted to him was made perfect and glorious, (2 Cor. 12: 7—9). So, too, while the light in the souls of John and Luther was never clouded, their bodily health was se-

THE MARBURG COLLOQUIUM, OCT. 1—3, 1529.

The adverse result of the diet, while it could not dismay, at least deeply distressed John and Luther. The latter, however, relying solely on the aid of God, whose power was sufficient to deliver from great perils, as well as from trivial inconveniences, could not be persuaded that the good cause was now menaced by greater dangers than it had formerly been. But Philip of Hesse, governed as he was by more carnal views, redoubled his efforts to strengthen his political alliances. Zurich was engaged in negotiations with the anti-imperial Catholic governments of France and Venice, and hence an alliance with Zurich seemed to him to be indispensable. His ambitious soul was absorbed by such plans, and he was sorely grieved by Luther's opposition to them; he imagined that this opposition might possibly be withdrawn, if Zwingli could succeed in favorably impressing Luther at a personal interview. With this hope he invited the several parties to hold the celebrated Colloquium at his palace in Marburg. Of this meeting, as well as of Zwingli's peculiarities of doctrine, in consequence of which he widely differed from the faith of Luther and Melancthon, we have already given an historical sketch in our last article, and we propose to supply here those details alone which we then reserved, in order to present in the present article a connected history of the origin of the Augsburg Confession.

The disputants had resolved that though they could not fully agree in doctrine, they would respectively obey the law of love. Zwingli took the offered hand of Luther, and words of personal good will were exchanged. The final act preceding their separation, was the joint recognition of those doctrinal points in which all agreed, and Luther was, by common consent, appointed to prepare a summary of them. When he performed this task, he appears to have regarded three classes of errorists, in opposition to whose unsound doctrines a statement of the pure doctrine was required: first, the Catholics (justification by faith, &c.); secondly, the Zwinglians (divinity of Christ, the Sacraments, &c.—on the subject

riously impaired by the anxieties in the midst of which they lived at this eventful period. They were only men—it was solely by the grace of God that, like Paul (1 Cor. 15: 10) they were "what they were." John's life, as in the case of his brother Frederic, was shortened by the mental labors which he performed, and which overtasked his frame. Luther often complains of the influence of his labors on his health, is distressed by violent pains in his head, &c. Letters, de Wette, III. 442, 496. IV. 15.

of Original Sin Luther did not think that entire unanimity had been secured); and thirdly, the Zwickau fanatics (Anabaptists; Infant Baptism, the Ministry, Government, &c.). These several points of doctrine were now submitted by him to the assembled theologians, in a pure scriptural form; the document consisted of *fifteen* articles, known in history as the *Marburg Articles*. They are found in a somewhat abbreviated form (the article on Infant Baptism being omitted) in the Jena edition of Luther's works, IV. 469, in that of Altenburg, IV. 563, and in the Wittenberg edition, from which Chytræus copied them in his *Historia*, p. 355 B. The original autograph was discovered a few years ago in the archives of electoral Hesse, and a fac-simile of it published by H. Heppe, Cassel, 1847; a second edition appeared in 1854, (die 15 marb. Artikel, &c.). Since the recent publication of the autograph, historians (Ranke III. 143, Guericke, Lindner, Kurtz, &c.) uniformly speak of the *fifteen* articles. A correct copy of the whole is given by Rudelbach in his *Ref. Luth. und Un.* pp. 665—668. We here insert an English translation which the Rev. Dr. Lintner of Schoharie, N. Y., published in the *Missionary* (Pittsburg Pa.) of Jan. 14, 1858. (As the learned translator faithfully adhered to the text of the Jena edition, the article there omitted is here supplied, as number 14.) We avail ourselves of the permission which our friend politely gave, to incorporate his translation with our article.

ARTICLES OF THE CONFERENCE OF MARBURG.

The undersigned have agreed upon the following Articles, in the Conference at Marburg, October 3d, 1529:

Article 1. We believe and hold that there is one true, living God, Creator of Heaven and Earth and all creatures, and that this same God, one in essence and nature, is three-fold in person, that is to say, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as was declared in the Council of Nice, and is still taught by the Universal Christian Church.

2. Neither the Father, nor the Holy Ghost, but the Son of the Father, was truly made man through the Holy Ghost, without the agency of man; born of the Virgin Mary, with a true body and soul, like unto other men, but free from sin.

3. The Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, inseparable in the person of Jesus Christ, was crucified, died, and was buried, rose from the dead, ascended into Heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God, Lord over all creatures for the future Judgment of the living and the dead.

4. Original Sin is an innate depravity, which we have inherited from Adam, and condemns all men. If Christ had not come to effect our deliverance by his death and resurrection, we must all have perished under the condemnation of this Sin, and could never have attained the Kingdom and Salvation of God.

5. We are delivered from Original Sin, as well as all other sins and everlasting death, by faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who died for us. Without such faith we cannot be released from Sin by any works, authority, or order of human invention.

6. True faith is the gift of God, which we cannot obtain by our own strength, works or merits. It is produced by the Holy Spirit working in our hearts, through the Gospel and word of God.

7. By means of such a faith, which is our righteousness before God, we are accounted obedient and holy, without any merit in ourselves. We are released from sin, death and hell, and saved by the grace of God, for His Son's sake, in whom we believe, and through whose righteousness we are made partakers of life and all spiritual blessings.

8. The Holy Spirit, ordinarily, does not work such a faith nor bestow His gifts, without the preaching of the Gospel and hearing of the word of God, by which means faith is produced, according to Romans 10.

9. Baptism is a holy Sacrament, which God has instituted for leading us to such a faith, and with the command and promises of God annexed to it, baptism is not a mere sign or ceremony among Christians, but a sign and work of God inducing faith by means of which we are born again.

10. Having been Justified and Sanctified by faith, it will also bring forth in us good works; such as love to our neighbor, calling on the Lord, and patiently suffering persecution.

11. Confession, or as it may be termed, seeking counsel of our Spiritual Instructors, should be voluntary and free. Still it is considered necessary, for persons laboring under the burden of sin, and the various temptations and errors into which they are liable to fall, that they may be delivered and comforted by the Gospel, which is the only true absolution.

12. The civil governments instituted by worldly powers, are to be regarded as necessary and useful ordinances, and are not forbidden, as is taught by some of the Papists and Anabaptists. Christians who are called to the government, or born to exercise its functions, may be saved by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, as a father or mother exercising government in the family.

13. Human institutions and traditions in religious and ecclesiastical matters, which are not contrary to the Scriptures, may be tolerated; as the disposition of the people, and other circumstances render expedient, that offences may be avoided, and peace and unity preserved. But we

condemn the doctrine, which forbids the marriage of the clergy, as a device of Satan.

14. The baptism of children is right (and proper); they are thereby presented to the grace of God, and received into (the pale of) Christianity.

15. With regard to the Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ, we believe that it ought to be celebrated in both kinds, according to the original institution. The Mass is not a work by which one man may procure grace for another, either in this life or after death. The Sacrament of the altar is the Sacrament of the true body and blood of Christ, and the spiritual partaking of this body and blood is necessary for every Christian, and the ordinance should be used as the word ordained of Almighty God, that weak consciences may be strengthened and encouraged in their faith and love to God through the Holy Spirit.

And although we are not agreed at present on the question whether the real body and blood of Christ are corporeally present in the bread and wine, yet both parties shall cherish more and more a truly Christian charity so far as conscience permits. And we will all earnestly implore the Lord to condescend by His Spirit to establish us in the true doctrine.

MARTINUS LUTHERUS,
 PHILIPPUS MELANCHTHON,
 JUSTUS JONAS,
 ANDREAS OSIANDER,
 JOHANNES BRENTIUS,
 STEPHANUS AGRICOLA,
 ULRICUS ZWINGLIUS,
 JOHANNES OECOLAMPADIUS,
 MARTINUS BUCERUS,
 CASPAR HEDIO.

The names of the signers were affixed Oct. 4 (Ranke III. 144); they suggest many reflections, for which we have no room here, and deserve attentive study. The reader will find that this series of articles is, both in form and expression, the original basis of the seventeen Swabach (Torgau) Articles, as given in the Evangelical Review, II. 78, to which we shall presently advert, and, ultimately, of the first twenty-one articles of the Augsburg Confession, and that it *does not* introduce the matters discussed in the last seven articles of that Confession.

THE SWABACH CONVENTION, OCT. 16, 1529.

The developments for which the Marburg Colloquium had furnished, as it seemed, incidentally, an occasion, made a deep impression on the devout mind of John; he resolved anew to be guided by divine truth exclusively, and, in accordance with Luther's pacific principles and soundness in the faith, to discard alike all carnal reliance on human measures of self-defence, and all false doctrine. With these views he and his allies held a convention at Swabach, Oct. 16, a few days after the Marburg events had become known. Luther had proceeded from Marburg to Schleiz, where he met John and also George of Brandenburg. His arguments convinced them that doctrinal unity was the sole basis of any political alliance or ecclesiastical union to which they could conscientiously give their assent, and which could be harmoniously maintained, or lead, by the divine blessing, to a successful issue. For the purpose of ascertaining the parties among whom that unity really existed, a doctrinal instrument was indispensable—and such a document *already existed* in its essential features. The history of this procedure has been involved in much obscurity, as several of the original manuscripts had disappeared, and have only recently been regained. The narratives of Salig, Cyprian and Seckendorf are all somewhat confused; the more recent statements of Köllner (*Symb.* Vol. I.) and Ranke, and an examination of those sets of articles to which we have had access, enable us, after considerable search, to present the following chronological order of events, which we believe to be strictly correct.

At Marburg fifteen articles were signed, Oct. 4, as we have seen. The next day Luther departed from Marburg (*Ranke* III. 144 n. 3). Köllner supposes, p. 165, and p. 168 n. 23, that Luther had (possibly on the morning of his departure, or the previous evening) "somewhat enlarged and altered" these fifteen articles, for any future purpose, and "then presented them, Oct. 16, 1529, at the second convention of Swabach." The chief argument which he adduces for this *unaccountably early* expansion of the fifteen articles to seventeen, is the following: Riederer (*Nachrichten*, &c.) found in a collection of original manuscripts of Luther, the autograph of his Preface to his own edition of the seventeen Swabach articles, in the publication entitled: *Auf das Schreyen etlicher Papisten über die 17 Artickel* ("On the Clamor of some

Papists &c.”). On this identical manuscript Veit Diedrich, one of Luther’s attendants, had written with his own hand the following in Latin: “Luther’s Preface, written at Coburg, to the seventeen articles written at Marburg.” Ranke appears to assume, as Köllner does, that this fact decides that Luther *had enlarged the articles already at Marburg*. Still, we are inclined to believe that Diedrich simply meant that these seventeen articles were, *substantially*, those on which the parties had agreed at Marburg, for they are really the same in their general tenor and contents. We fully agree with Köllner in the remark, p. 168, that “the first foundation of the Augsburg Confession was laid at the Zwinglian Colloquium of Marburg,” but the purpose and precise time of the *extension* of the fifteen to seventeen articles, which is not explained by the authors before us, may perhaps be conceived of in the following manner.

On the 5th of October Luther proceeded without loss of time from Marburg to Schleiz, carrying with him, as we assume, a copy of the fifteen articles *in the state in which they had been signed*. Here he met John and the margrave George; they resolved to adhere to the principle of doctrinal unity at the approaching (second Swabach) convention. The Protestants had already held a consultation at Rotach in June, for the purpose of concerting measures of self-defence, and then proposed to adopt formal articles of confederation at a subsequent convention, to be held in Swabach. The landgrave Philip, whose ambitious projects led him to under-rate the importance of agreement in doctrinal truth, now addressed a letter to John, written in his characteristic style, urging him to adopt decisive measures, insisting that agreement of doctrine respecting the sacraments was not indispensable, and threatening to dissolve his alliance with John, if the latter permitted himself to be swayed by religious scruples, in place of being governed by political considerations. John replied with calmness, repeating his favorite remark that he would, under all circumstances, adhere exclusively to the Word of God. When the important day arrived, the first act was the presentation of *seventeen* articles, as the only basis of union. These had been prepared by Luther, and *they* constitute the articles now known as the *Swabach Articles*, but formerly styled those of *Torgau*. It was long a contested point whether they coincided with any other known series of articles, or were an independent doctrinal statement. But as it was known that the commissioners of the Zwinglian

city of Ulm had declined to sign them, the sagacity of Frick, the translator of Seckendorf, led him to search for them in the archives of that city, where he actually discovered them; he inserts them in his translation, p. 968. Of their genuineness no doubt is entertained (Köllner, 158). To the surprise of all, these Swabach articles were found to be identical with those which Luther himself had once been compelled to publish. It appears that a copy of these articles had been obtained surreptitiously and published; several papist theologians (Wimpina &c.) issued an answer, in which they criticised the articles. This publication induced Luther to republish his articles.

To this document, *Auf das Schreyen*, &c., we have already referred; it is given by Cyprian (Beyl. p. 159), together with the Preface, the autograph of which was, as we observed, discovered by Riederer. The articles coincide with those which occur in the Altenb. ed. of Luther's works, V. 14, where they stand in an isolated form, simply bearing the title: "Bekenntniß christlicher Lehre und Glaubens, durch Dr. M. L. in XVII artickel verfasst"—that is, "Confession of Christian doctrine and faith, &c." Chytræus presents them in the same form, simply adding the date to the title: "Anno 1530," and in his notes at the end of the volume remarking that they were "the first formula from which the articles of the Augsburg Confession were prepared." An English translation was given in 1850 by Rev. Dr. Krauth, Jr., in the *Ev. Rev.* II. 78, under the old title of "Articles of Torgau." If the reader will compare them with Dr. Lintner's translation of the Marburg articles, he will observe both the essential agreement of the two series in the order of subjects and general tenor, particularly in the first nine articles, and also the *expansion* which the original Marburg draught received before it was adopted at Swabach. We think that these changes, for which neither Köllner nor Ranke accounts, may be now explained, if the conjecture which we here submit is well-founded: *After* Luther's departure from Marburg, and *before* the Swabach convention—an interval of at most eleven days—he is directed by John to prepare a doctrinal basis of union. Now he could simply re-assert the points of his faith which he had already submitted at Marburg, and hence the same topics (Trinity, Original Sin, Faith, Sacraments, &c., &c.) re-appear. But as it was desirable, under *these more favorable circumstances*, to set forth these points in their Gospel fulness, and not in that somewhat meagre

form, which alone could secure the consent of the Zwinglians, Luther was naturally led at this time, according to our theory, to express his doctrines with greater breadth*—that is, during this period of eleven days. The new document, generally following the order of the Marburg articles, but moving with more freedom, now appears in recent writers under the title of "Swabach Articles." It was, according to Luther's express statement, not originally prepared for the diet of Augsburg, as his enemies had asserted. A comparison of the dates conclusively demonstrates this fact. These articles existed already in October 1529, whereas the proclamation which convoked that Diet, is dated Bologna, Jan. 21, 1530. At the close of the year 1529, another convention was held in Smalcald by the evangelical party, for the purpose of again concerting measures for the establishment of a defensive alliance against the papists. An official report was here presented, from which it appeared that the ambassadors who had been directed to offer a copy of the Protestation to the emperor, had been arrested as criminals, and that the latter had with the utmost indignation refused to receive the document. Luther and John nevertheless adhered to their principle that the first essential measure consisted in fidelity to the divine Word, since it was the indispensable condition on which they could hope for divine aid. The Zwinglian members of the convention were now unwilling to abandon *their* doctrine for

* When the somewhat incomplete presentation of Gospel truth in the Marburg articles, is compared with the original eight "fundamentals" of the "Evangelical Alliance" of 1846—the latest machinery employed for propagating British and American sects in the Protestant countries of the continent of Europe—the former are found to be comparatively full of heavenly light and life. The latter are so distressingly jejune, so rigid in their refusal to recognize the glory of the Person of Christ, and yet so fearful of dealing impolitely with fallen human nature, so unwilling to believe that the holy Sacraments are more than empty ceremonies, so jealous in defending the right of private judgment and the office of the ministry, and yet so determined utterly to ignore the very existence of the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood, so skilful in evading the salient points of Gospel doctrine, and yet so bungling in meeting the charge of actual infidelity, that a *ninth fundamental* in very shame was afterwards added, so destitute of the Spirit of Christ, that if good men had not, in a temporary fit of enthusiasm, subscribed them, we should be disposed to believe that none but a heartless man, as their author, could so return the Savior's love! God preserve us from such modern creeds! May he preserve the Lutheran Church in the United States from every "unionistic" measure which would require the sacrifice of one jot or one tittle of that holy "faith which was once delivered to the saints."

the sake of establishing an alliance—why should John renounce *his* precious doctrine? The Protestants finally adopted a resolution (re-affirmed at the Nuremberg convention of Jan. 6, 1530) in which they declared that they could not conscientiously enter into any political union with parties which withheld their assent from the seventeen Swabach articles. These have accordingly acquired a high historical importance, as they were the first confessional statement which discriminated between the Protestants or Lutherans, on the one hand, and the Zwinglians and Catholics on the other.

THE DIET OF AUGSBURG, 1530.

The actual views and expectations of the Elector at this precise period are easily ascertained. The situation of the Lutherans, which was embarrassing in the highest degree, seemed to allow them only a choice between two opposite modes of procedure: first, to form a close alliance with the Reformed Swiss cantons and the Catholic parties that were opposed to the house of Austria, and concert with them a plan for conducting military operations—or, secondly, to unite with the Catholic reform-party in issuing a call for a general Church Council or National Assembly, which might result in the establishment of a German national Church, so far released from subjection to the pope, and purified in doctrine and usages, that they could conscientiously remain in connection with it. The former course it was now deemed inexpedient to choose; the absence of internal union, the admixture of political designs of a suspicious character, the political convulsions to which it would inevitably lead, the certainty that such heterogeneous parties, even if they prevailed in a struggle with the imperial troops, would never be able to establish a pure creed, and in addition the fear of God's displeasure—were the causes which decided John and Luther to reject it. The other course (although eventually also found impracticable) would not identify them more unequivocally with papists than the former; it seemed to allow the hope that the question at issue would be satisfactorily adjusted, that popish abuses would be suppressed, and that the evangelical religion would be peacefully restored to the liberty and predominance to which it was entitled. Hence they were disposed to adopt this course, if fair terms—such as devout men could accept—should be proposed. Luther said: "God is faithful and will not forsake us," and quoted the

words: "In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength." (Isaiah 30: 15). Ranke exclaims: "Such a course (of the Protestants) was not politically wise—we might, like others, take exception to it—but, in view of this conscientious deference for the divine will, *it was sublime.*" (III. 150, 151).

The conduct of Luther and John in declining an alliance with the Swiss and other Zwinglians, and still regarding a union with the Catholics as possible under certain circumstances, has often been misunderstood. The union with the Catholics which they contemplated, consisted in the adoption by the latter of the Protestant faith! They had *protested*—but that act was not a withdrawal from the Christian Church. The Church of Rome, as such, was still, in their view, at this time, capable of being restored to purity of doctrine and life. There were millions of souls still subject to its influence. Would it be right in the eyes of God to abandon all these, without another effort to conduct them to a purer faith? The Lutherans very reluctantly renounced the hope of this restoration. They could scarcely believe the appalling fact that the festering sores of the Church of Rome, which made it an abomination in the eyes of God, were utterly incurable; they did not immediately perceive, that if they desired to be the instruments of God in the work of rescuing the Gospel from the pestilential errors which surrounded it, the only alternative which remained, consisted in their absolute and complete withdrawal from that polluted Sodom, and in carrying the Church and the Means of Grace with them into a purified atmosphere. Hence the address to Charles V., which constitutes the Preface or introduction of the Augsburg Confession, still expresses such views and feelings as occur in the following passages: "In obedience to your Majesty's demand, we now offer in defence of our religion, the Confession of our adherents and ourselves, the doctrine of which, drawn from the Holy Scriptures — — they deliver—and discuss in our churches. For, if the other electors &c. [the papal party] shall produce their opinions on the subject of religion, we are here ready to consult on friendly terms with those princes — on the means by which we may come to an agreement — — and, having peaceably discussed the subjects of difference among ourselves, to consult how the dissensions may be suppressed, through the grace of God, and *how one true, harmonious religion* may be preserved; that, as we all live and serve under *one Christ*, and ought to acknowledge one Christ, — — all opinions likewise may be conformed to the standard

of divine truth,—an event which we implore from God in our most fervent supplications." They next remark, that if, nevertheless, a reconciliation should not be effected, "we, at least, shall leave the clearest evidence — — from our Confession, *that we have withheld no effort which might contribute to the restoration of Christian harmony, consistent with the will of God and the dictates of conscience.*" At the close of the address they say that if their efforts to adjust the existing dissensions amicably, should fail, they next propose to plead their cause before a "general, free and Christian Council (of the whole Church)"—they refer to the general wish, to the "unanimous voices" of all parties, that a competent tribunal should pronounce the final decision. "In this appeal," they say, "we continue to persist, nor do we intend, nor are we able to abandon it, unless the difficulty between the parties be settled," and Christian harmony be restored. Then follow the twenty-eight articles of the Augsburg Confession (Book of Concord, Newm. 2d ed, pp. 107–109.) This course of the Protestants is a beautiful illustration of that charity which "hopeth all things, endureth all things" (1 Cor. 13: 7.) The sentiments expressed in this address, which was elaborated by Melancthon, were adopted by Luther, who doubtless refers to them when he pronounces a judgment on the whole Confession, and says, somewhat humorously: *Ich kann nicht so sanft und leise treten.* Indeed, the Reformers did not feel at liberty to withdraw from the ecclesiastical organization with which they had always been connected, until every measure which charity dictated, had been adopted. But they soon obtained the fullest light. Under the influence of analogous, long-cherished feelings, even the apostle Peter could not form clear views of Christian duty and liberty, until additional revelations had been granted (Acts 10: 15, 28; 11: 1–18). The "apostles and brethren" at length understood the true character of the Gospel, and learned to discriminate between Judaism and Christianity. Luther and John were taught to understand that Christianity was incompatible with Popery in all the forms and the spirit of the latter, and now they averted their faces from the unclean thing. It still maintains an existence, but of its decrepitude and utter separation from God and his truth, we have a revolting exhibition in the recent recognition by the Pope of the "immaculate conception" of Mary, who is now made equal to Christ, for her sinlessness is now distinctly maintained—a doctrine so monstrous, that the councils and popes even of

the darkest ages, did not venture to give it their official sanction.

The emperor and Clemens VII. had, in the meantime, agreed on terms referring to the pacification of Italy, at an interview in Bologna, towards the close of the year 1529; on February 24, 1530, the pope presided at the coronation of Charles V. in the presence of the French ambassador. The emperor had already pledged himself at the peace of Barcelona, June 29, 1529, to employ all the resources of the empire for the purpose of converting the Protestants, or of exterminating them, and a favorable period for redeeming that pledge had now arrived. He had secured at least a temporary peace with his most dangerous enemies, and the rapid progress of the Reformation, to which the Protestation of Spires had given new life and vigor, claimed his undivided personal attention. Before he left Bologna, he accordingly issued a summons (Jan. 21, 1530) directing that a new Diet should be held in the city of Augsburg on the 8th of April, and the following days. The portion which refers to the religious question of the day, is of special moment; it is declared by Köllner, p. 154, with strict historical truth to have been the original cause which led to the preparation of the Augsburg Confession, in its present form. The whole proclamation was written in a pacific spirit; after speaking of the religious disputes which prevailed, the emperor desires both parties (Catholics and Protestants) to be prepared to state their views, opinions and thoughts on the subject in dispute; he promises to listen kindly, and consider every statement with impartiality, and he avows his strong desire to adjust all the difficulties to the satisfaction of both parties; he also expresses the hope that as all believed in the same Savior, all would ultimately concur in professing the same Christian faith. These sentiments (which were afterwards quoted in the Preface of the Augsburg Confession, in the extracts given above) were repeated at the opening of the diet, (Monday, June 20) in the "Proposition" or opening address read in the emperor's presence, and corresponding somewhat to the modern "speech from the throne." In this imperial address the parties are directed to present their views in writing, both in German and in Latin, and to specify "the abuses" which it might be desirable to correct, as well as the doctrines respecting which differences of opinion prevailed ("ein jeglicher sein gut bedüncken, opinion und meinung der berürten irrung und zwyspalt, auch *missbreuch* halben—zu Deutsch

und Latein in Schrift stellen und uberantworten;" Chytræus, who gives the original, p. 50 sqq. from which we carefully copy, fourth ed. 1580, furnishes the best orthography of the age.) Let the reader observe that the emperor refers to the "abuses" as prominent matters of complaint on the part of the Lutherans, and he will already be enabled to form a conception of the nature of the topics which the expected statement or confession would introduce.

While John, who had received the imperial summons to the diet on March 11, was deliberating on the course which duty would require him to pursue, his judicious chancellor Brück (Pontanus) advised compliance with the imperial requisition, and referred to the advantages which would be derived from a written statement of Protestant views, when publicly presented; he deemed it expedient that while John, as a member of the diet, should officially present such a written statement, the document itself should be carefully prepared, according to the teachings of the Scriptures, by the theologians; the latter would not, as he apprehended, be permitted to defend their cause in person. John accordingly sent a copy of the proclamation, on March 14, to the Wittenberg divines, Luther, Jonas, Bugenhagen and Melancthon. The letter which he addressed to them at the same time, directed that they should at once lay aside every other matter which occupied them, and prepare the document or declaration of religious opinion which the imperial summons required; he desired them to furnish him, as the letter says, "with articles referring to the matter in dispute, with respect both to doctrine and also to other points, namely, *external ecclesiastical customs and ceremonies*" (Köllner, 156). He added that, as the time was short, they should communicate this statement of religious views within six days, by the 20th of the month, at Torgau, where he was established, and then be prepared to accompany him to Coburg, on the way to Augsburg. The theologians immediately complied, and prepared certain writings which were, some days afterwards, presented at Torgau.

At this point a grave historical difficulty presents itself, referring to the identity, substance, authorship, &c., of these writings. That certain "Torgau" papers really constituted the matter of the subsequent Augsburg Confession, according to the traditional account given by writers previous to the recent discovery of the documents, is already evident from a

letter of the elector to Luther, dated Augsburg, May 11; the writer says: "After you and our other learned men of Wittenberg had, in accordance with our desire, drawn up the articles on *contested religious* points, we will not withhold the information from you that Magister Philip Melanchthon has re-examined (*weiter übersehen*) them, and combined them into one statement (*in eine Form gezogen*) which we hereby transmit to you, &c." This letter was written ten days after John and Melanchthon had reached Augsburg; at Coburg the latter had sketched the Preface of the Confession, but the work of preparing that Confession itself, he commenced only after his arrival in Augsburg, (Köllner p. 170). *In these ten days the Augsburg Confession is written*, for the same letter now proceeds to solicit Luther to subject the accompanying work of Melanchthon to a close revision, and to add or expunge according to his judgment. With the well-known answer of Luther, of May 15, which is given by all the writers before us, he returns the document, *which was the Augsburg Confession in its complete state*, stamped with the seal of his approbation. It is not to be supposed that in this comparatively short period of ten days, Melanchthon could have completed the Confession, if we do not assume that his task consisted simply in classifying the materials on hand. The preparation of a new and original document, in whole or in part, of such vast importance, by a man so slow to regard his work as well done and complete, is inconceivable.

But *what* constituted the materials from which Melanchthon's skilful pen produced the Augsburg Confession? This point was for more than a century involved in obscurity; the discovery of a number of the original manuscripts, to which we have already referred, has at length greatly simplified the matter. We have already seen that the seventeen articles, often called by earlier writers the "Torgau," are really the "Swabach" Articles. It seems to follow that the term "Torgau Articles" must be the general name for the whole collection of manuscripts presented at *Torgau* to the elector, in conformity to his wish expressed in the letter above, and subsequently placed in Melanchthon's hands for the purpose of being combined in one homogeneous confession. That the seventeen articles constituted only *the smallest part* of the Augsburg Confession, is apparent from the article of Dr. Krauth, Jr. (Ev. Rev. II. 78) to which we have already adverted. It there appears that, with the exception of three short articles, the first twenty-one of the Augsburg Confes-

sion exhaust that series, and we have not yet accounted for the last seven Articles, which constitute *three-fourths* of the whole Confession. Guided partly by Köllner's exposition, and partly by other documentary evidence, we arrive at the following results.

The Wittenberg theologians, Luther, Justus Jonas, Bugenhagen (Pomeranus) and Melanchthon, are directed, March 14, to furnish articles on contested points in the doctrines and usages of the church of Rome. On the same day at noon (*Hora 12. 14. Martii*. de Wette III. 564) Luther writes to Jonas, whose temporary absence from Wittenberg was occasioned by an ecclesiastical visitation; he communicates the order of the elector, and adds that he, together with Bugenhagen and Melanchthon, would on that day and the next (*hodie et eras*) comply with John's desire, as far as it lay in their power, in the absence of Jonas, whom he then urges to return immediately and join his colleagues on the next day. These theologians appear to have first consulted together; then, certain subjects may *possibly* have been assigned to each, as the short time allowed to them, demanded a division of labor (*festinata enim sunt omnia*, says Luther in the letter,) and these several writings or articles, referring respectively to different subjects, but all alike proceeding from the same hallowed source of truth, were at once transferred to the Elector. In preparing them, Luther and Melanchthon, first of all, as Köllner says, p. 166, adopted the Swabach articles, as corresponding to the request of the elector in reference to strictly doctrinal points; some topics, not fully presented there, are exhibited in new articles, for instance, the present twentieth article on Faith and Good Works. Their attention was, however, chiefly directed to the preparation of new articles on external *abuses*, as *evidences of the corrupt doctrines* of the popish system; to such "abuses", indeed, both the emperor's proclamation and the elector's request directly referred. These were now first exhibited in specific articles, and the several unconnected documents were submitted to the elector at Torgau (Köllner 166). The whole collection constitutes, strictly speaking, the "Torgau Articles" or Torgau Papers. These manuscripts were, at a comparatively recent period, discovered by K. E. Förstemann in the Weimar archives, and published in his "Urkundenbuch, &c.," 2 vols. Halle. 1833. "They constitute," says Köllner, p. 159, "the basis of the second part (the last seven articles) of the Augsburg Confession *de abusibus mutatis* (on the abuses

which have been corrected). Of this fact no doubt can any longer be entertained, as these writings in part agree word for word with the German copy or text of the second part of the Augsburg Confession." This collection of new matter received temporarily the name of "Wittenberg Bedenken" (opinions, or statement of views.) From these materials, which were either furnished by Luther himself, or examined and adopted by him as the expression of his views of religious truth, Melanchthon, who had also personally assented to them at Wittenberg, constructed the Augsburg Confession.

Even at this late period, however, when the Elector received the papers at Torgau (after the 21st of March), the Protestants had not formed an entirely clear conception of the precise character which they should give to the written statement for which the imperial proclamation called. Should it assume the form of an apologetical statement, that is, a defence of the ecclesiastical reforms which they had effected? Or should it simply express their doctrinal position, as that of Christians, so that they might be distinguished from Jews and Mohammedans, with whom they had been confounded by the ignorant? Should it breathe a conciliatory spirit, and express the hope which they could not yet entirely abandon, that in place of appearing as schismatics, they might still retain their connection with the church, after it had been cleansed from its pollutions? Or should they furnish, strictly speaking, a Confession of Faith, resembling the ancient symbols, but fuller and more comprehensive in its defence of sound doctrine and profitable church usages? To none of such questions could a categorical answer be given, until the complexion which affairs might assume at Augsburg should have been more clearly ascertained. The materials—the Torgau papers—were now in Melanchthon's hands, in a somewhat unconnected form, but they were full and complete as a whole, and it was obvious that an appropriate document, suited to the exigences of the case, could readily be constructed from them. John, who had personally examined them, and thoroughly understood the merits of the case, could suggest no additions.

On the third of April the elector departed from Torgau, attended by an imposing retinue, consisting of numerous princes and noblemen. Luther, Jonas, Spalatin and Melanchthon also accompanied him. The party passed the following Sunday (it was Palm-Sunday) at Weimar, where the Lord's Supper was administered to John and other devout

Christians. They continued their journey on the following days; at every point Luther was solicited to deliver a sermon. On Maundy-Thurs day and Good Friday, as well as at other times, he accordingly conducted divine service. On Saturday they reached Coburg, where John observed the festival of Easter and remained during several of the following days. At this place, which was not far distant from Augsburg, John possessed a fortified castle, the Ehrenberg, constructed on a lofty hill near the line which constituted the boundary between his own dominions and the adjoining territories. Here Luther remained, as the circumstance that the ban of the empire, pronounced at Worms, had not been removed, rendered it unsafe for him to leave the elector's dominions. From this point he addressed a number of remarkable letters to his correspondents (de Wette IV), among which we may refer, as an instance of his serenity of mind, to the well-known sportive letter, descriptive of the "Diet of the Jackdaws," which inhabited the same venerable pile. . . While the party proceeded to the neighboring battle-field of Augsburg, Luther, like another Moses (Exod. 17 : 11) held up his hands on a commanding eminence, and prayed that the people of God might prevail. "I will pray, and call for help," he writes to Melanchthon, April 22, (de Wette IV. 3), "until I know that my cry is heard in heaven."

On the first of May, which had subsequently been designated as the period for opening the Diet, John reached Augsburg, but the emperor, who had been detained by the complication of his Italian affairs, did not arrive till the 15th of June. It was during this eventful period of six weeks that the Lutherans were at length enabled to form a clear conception of the nature of the task assigned to them by the emperor, and to determine the precise character and the contents of the document which it would be appropriate to present. The Augsburg Confession, already existing in the Torgau papers, now first assumed the fully developed form in which we at present possess it.* At Augsburg, as the temporary

* We do not, of course, here refer to the more or less imperfectly translated English copies of the first twenty-one articles, which have at times appeared, but to the genuine twenty-eight articles. Those who are familiar with the former only, and then happily meet with a faithful translation of the whole, are often as much surprised as Luther once was, when a student in Erfurt, according to one of the charming *Historien* of Mathesius. He there first saw a copy of the entire Bible, in Latin. On examining the volume, he was surprised to find "many more texts, Gospels and Epistles," than he had ever heard explained in the pulpits of the day.

focus of intelligence, the Protestants were taught both by the communications of friends and by the insinuations of enemies to understand their true position, (Cyprian, p. 67), the relations which they sustained to the cause of divine truth, and the decisive influence for good or for evil, which the statement expected of them, would necessarily exercise on the mind and heart of the nation for all future times. The delay of the emperor's arrival, apparently occasioned by his political interests, was doubtless ordered by Providence, so that this Augsburg Confession of faith, to which all subsequent orthodox confessions of the age of the Reformation were conformed, might meet the wants of the Church of Christ, and set forth the holy, unalterable and divine doctrines of the Scriptures, after due deliberation, in a spirit of unintermitted prayer, and of tried and unwavering faith. Let us examine the position of affairs.

The Protestants had never yet found an opportunity to set forth their doctrines before a suitable tribunal. Their writings were eagerly seized by hostile papists, and sometimes republished in a mutilated form, or with slanderous notes and explanations; their doctrines were distorted by an envenomed spirit in every imaginable manner. Hence the most absurd opinions respecting their Christian character and their doctrine, were entertained by the popish population in general, and even by some intelligent Catholics. The several weeks which they, like other parties, passed in Augsburg, while all waited for the emperor's arrival, furnished them with a more favorable opportunity than they had previously found, for ascertaining the sentiments that generally prevailed among their adversaries. They now determined that, with the help of God, they would boldly meet their opponents on the floor of the diet, where their voice could be heard without interruption, and then set forth their views in a Christian, candid and fearless manner. Melancthon was appointed to write out the statement according to the materials in his hands, and embody in it the leading points on which they differed from the church of Rome. Many consultations were held by the Protestant divines, messages between them and Luther at Coburg were continually interchanged, and a clear conception was finally developed of the nature and contents of such a confession of faith as the particular circumstances required. It also became apparent that the document should be presented to the diet, not only in the name of John, but also of the other members (princes, representatives of free

cities, &c.), who concurred in the adoption of Lutheran views. Philip of Hesse in vain attempted to secure the coöperation of the Swiss Reformed; the opposition which he found on all sides to his favorite measure, compelled him to abandon it. This disappointment of his political expectations rendered it doubtful at one time whether he would unite with John in presenting the Confession; better principles subsequently prevailed, and he resumed his place as a Protestant prince.

It is now clear, when the historical facts are examined with an unbiased mind, that the chief purpose for which the Augsburg Confession was prepared, was, in the view of its authors the following: To define the position of the Lutherans, or, in other words, to assign the causes for which they, as Protestants, could no longer remain in communion with the church of Rome, unless that church would reform the abuses in doctrine and practice which had been gradually introduced, and return to the pure doctrine and the wholesome usages of the apostolic Church. This fact, so distinctly revealed by the light of history, enables us to decide a question which various garbled translations of the Augsburg Confession (as unhistorical in their form as they are untheological and puerile in spirit and in execution) have rendered perplexing to many minds, viz.—Which of the articles, if any, are of comparatively secondary importance, and which really constitute the matter, being and very life of the Augsburg Confession? The main task of the Lutherans consisted in the vindication of their course, in as far as they had corrected the gross abuses of the times, such as the unscriptural mode of administering the Lord's Supper, and in general the abuses connected with the mass,* Confession, monastic vows, episcopal jurisdiction, &c. It was, at the same time, indispensable, before they should proceed to this work as the main task, to remove the false impressions which Catholic slanders had produced on the minds of some individuals. For this latter

* "The name *missa* catech. and fid. occurs first in Augustine and in the acts of the council at Carthage, A. D. 398. It arose from the formula of dismissal at the close of each part of the services, and is equivalent to *missio*, *dismissal*. *Missa* (*mass*) afterwards came to denote exclusively the celebration of the holy communion."—Dr. Schaff: Hist. of the Chr. Ch. 383. n. 8. We trust that this simple historical fact, after having been repeatedly explained, is now at last better understood by those writers who had for a year or two, in consequence of unacquaintance with the ancient ecclesiastical terminology, persisted in denying the original meaning of the word *Mass*, before the rise of Popery, as simply equivalent to the "administration of the Lord's Supper."

purpose, a comparatively brief exposition of Christian doctrine would be sufficient (the first twenty-one articles); the other and more important object of the Confession, evidently was—to set forth fully the reasons for which they had ceased to be papists and had become Protestant Christians or Lutherans; to this work they accordingly assigned by far the larger part of the whole statement (the last seven articles, numerically fewer, but, in the aggregate, of considerably more than twice the length of the former). A glance at the facts is sufficient to show that these seven articles, in view of the peculiar circumstances, contain the gist of the Confession. The introductory twenty-one articles, forming Part I., are purely doctrinal, and are designed to refute three charges:—first, that the Lutherans had ceased to be Christians, by adopting heathenish doctrines; secondly, that they were infected with the immoral and seditious principles of the Anabaptist fanatics; thirdly, that they coincided with Zwingli in lowering the rank of the Sacraments to that of mere forms or ceremonies. As intelligent papists, like the emperor and many princes, bishops, &c., already discriminated between the Protestants on the one hand, and other anti-popish parties on the other, these three charges could be answered with comparative brevity, or by a simple re-affirmation of the ancient faith or creeds of the early Church, prior to the development of popery. Melancthon could find nothing better suited to meet this want comprehensively and directly, than precisely Luther's seventeen Swabach articles, which the Marburg conference had suggested to the latter. The position of these articles—now first expanded into *twenty-one*—as the introduction of the Confession, was dictated by the circumstances; it demonstrated at the very threshold, the *Christian* character of the Protestants. We proceed to furnish the evidence that these twenty-one articles were intended to be not so much expressive of the Lutheran faith specially, as rather of the common faith of the whole Christian Church, contradistinguished from Judaism, Mohammedism and Paganism.

Cardinal Campeggio presented a memorial to the emperor at the time of the diet of Augsburg, the original of which Ranke believes to be a manuscript which he found in a Roman library (History of the Popes, translated by Kelly, p. 48, n. He gives extracts from it in his valuable Appendix to that work, p. 435, No. 19.) The Cardinal uses the following language: "In some places in Germany, all the Christian

rites handed down to us from the ancient holy fathers, have been abolished through the suggestions of these scoundrels: the sacraments are no longer administered; vows are no longer observed, and marriages are contracted promiscuously, and within the forbidden degrees, &c." He urges the emperor "to constrain the German heretics by fire and sword to return to the holy Catholic faith," or else to arrest their "diabolical course" by a "radical extirpation of these noxious and venomous weeds." Leo X. had described the Lutherans already in 1521 as traitors, &c., who were worthy of an eternal curse. (Cypr. 56) Adrian termed Luther "the destruction of the Christian religion, and the emperor had, as early as the Diet of Worms, denounced Luther as a criminal, who released his adherents from all law, and taught them to lead a beastly (*viehisch*) life. (Altb. ed. I. 737). King Sigismund of Poland declared that he would put all evangelical heretics to death, as subverters of morals and church-order, who fraudulently scattered poison among the people. Henry VIII. of England published abroad that Luther was worse than any Turk or Saracen or infidel. King Lewis of Hungary, on being informed that Luther rejected the principal doctrines of Christianity, passed a law in 1521 that every Lutheran should be burned alive. The following fact is, however, specially important. Alphonso Valdez, a secretary of Charles V. (not Juan Valdez, the secretary of the viceroy of Naples, a friend of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, Ranke, Popes, p. 55, Guericke III. 270) made the following remark to Melanchthon, a week before the Confession was presented to the emperor: "The Spaniards firmly believe that the Lutherans entertain an unholy doctrine respecting the nature of God, the Trinity and the Virgin Mary, and hence they believe that they do God the most acceptable service, whenever they kill a Lutheran." (Cypr. 56-58) He also impressed on the mind of Melanchthon the importance of convincing the emperor that the Lutherans were sound in the faith of the church, e. g. Trinity, &c. (Seck. Germ. 1041). The morals of the Protestants were described as loose and infamous, and they were denominated a pestilent body of men, who outraged all the laws of God and man.

Melanchthon and his associates accordingly saw at this juncture, that while such charges were too absurd to be believed by the more intelligent and reflecting members of the diet, a brief statement of Christian doctrine in general, must

necessarily constitute a part of the written defence. It was accordingly decided to introduce the doctrines of the Trinity, Divinity of Christ, &c., in the form adopted by the ancient church. Those articles, further, which refer to the Ministry, Church, civil Polity and Government, &c., not only contributed like the former, to demonstrate the decidedly orthodox and Christian character of the Protestants, but also to establish the fact that they were not identified with the lawless Anabaptists. Those on Original Sin, the Sacraments, &c., proved that they did not entertain the alleged (rationalistic) errors of Zwingli, to which we referred in our former article. Those, finally, on Justification, Church rites, Confession, and especially Faith and Good Works and the Worship of Saints, which advanced views very different from those entertained by the papists, were designed, pre-eminently, to show that all the departures of the Protestants from the prevailing popish doctrines, constituted in reality a return to those of God's Word, and the early church. As the larger number of these points had been so successfully stated by Luther in the Swabach articles, the latter were adopted unanimously as a fit introduction to the main discussion, in Part II. that is, art. XXII—XXVIII, "on the Abuses corrected." The identity of the matter in the Swabach articles and in the first twenty-one of the present Augsburg Confession, may be seen by referring to the translation of the former in the *Evangelical Review*, II. 78—83.*

If the Augsburg Confession had terminated at this point, as the violent suppression of the last seven articles in a few comparatively recent publications, seems to imply, the great purpose for which the Confession was prepared, would have been very strangely overlooked. For the seventeen articles, constituting the substance of nearly all of the twenty-one of the Augsburg Confession, *had already been published*, and been also reviewed by four popish theologians, (Wimpina, Mensing, Redörfer and Elgersma) in a treatise addressed to the elector Joachim of Brandenburg, and reprinted in Luther's works, (Altb. ed. V. 16—20.) "In their reply," says Dr. Krauth, Jr., whose terse abstract we transcribe from the

* The translator has there indicated the parallel parts under each article of the former. Of the entire seventeen, fourteen occur in Part I. of the Augsburg Confession; the last three were more appropriately transferred to the main body of the Augsburg Confession, and now appear respectively in art. 27, 24 and 26.

Ev. Rev., II. 83,* "they reproach Luther for having mingled so much, which they were compelled to acknowledge as orthodox, with his errors, but find a reason for it in his disposition to dilute in this way the poison of error, so as to secure for it a more ready reception. They take up the articles one by one. The first three they approve, in the fourth, though disposed to cavil, they are unable to lay hold of anything which they show to be reprehensible; on the fifth they say, that we are justified by that faith which worketh by love, which Luther by no means denied, though he properly separated love from the act of justification; confounding faith with a mere intellectual apprehension of religion, they object that it is consistent with the commission of enormous sins; on the sixth and seventh, they have nothing but verbal niceties; on the eighth, they contend for several sacraments; on the ninth, they trifle; on the tenth, they maintain transubstantiation and the communion in one kind; on the eleventh, they insist upon sacramental confession in accordance with the papal statutes; on the twelfth, they present the ordinary arguments for the visible church, which they, of course, hold to be the Romish; the thirteenth they do not seriously object to; on the fourteenth, they put the ecclesiastical magistracy on the same footing with the secular; the fifteenth and sixteenth they wholly reject, and whilst they do not deny the seventeenth, they insist upon knowing from Luther what ceremonies he regards as in conflict with the Word of God." These theologians here betray their disappointment; they discover chiefly ancient doctrines to which the Church had always assented, and only modify the Lutheran language in some cases. *Something more direct was now needed.* That our representation of the incompleteness of the first twenty-one articles, or rather, their imperfect adaptation to the present emergency, and consequently their subordinate character, as compared with the last seven, is strictly correct, appears from the views expressed by various contemporaries. Spalatin, for instance, in the list of the subjects of the twenty-eight articles, which he prepared (inserted in Altenb. ed. V. 152), after giving the titles of the first twenty-one, thus proceeds: "Then followed the *contested articles* (streitige artikel) &c." He then subjoins the titles of the seven—evidently

* We trust our esteemed friend will excuse this unceremonious appropriation of matter which he has prepared with so much care; if his writings possessed only mediocre merit, we should not disturb their repose.

regarding the latter as the direct and principal matter of the Confession, in view of the times and circumstances. The following fact removes the last doubt.

It is well known that after the presentation of the Augsburg Confession, the popish theologians (Eckius, Faber, Wimpina, Cochläus, &c.) were directed by the emperor to prepare a reply—the “Confutation;” the task was confessedly difficult, when leviathan was to be drawn out with a hook. Still, after several mortifying failures, these men produced a paper which they styled a “Confutation” of the Lutheran confession. We have it before us in Latin, in Pfaff’s Appendix to his edition of the Symbolical Books, and in a German translation in Chytræus, p. 135 B. Cochläus himself published a brief summary, which is given in Altb. ed. V. 221 and Cyprian, Beyl. No. 35, p. 196. This Confutation reviews the entire twenty-eight articles, and is doubtless the best popish matter which could be furnished; for after writing five confutations, one of which Charles, in his disgust, tore up with his own imperial hands, to the bitter vexation of Eckius, we have here, in the *sixth* copy, the blossoms and fruits of the arduous labors of six weeks. We have prepared the following abstract: Articles 1, 3, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19, of the present Augsburg Confession, are admitted without hesitation, or very slightly modified; the terms are, *acceptanda est, nihil quod offendet, probatur, zugelassen, annehmen*. Articles 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 15, are admitted in part, and rejected in part; *comprobatur quidem—sed; acceptatur—at rejicitur; zugelassen zum Theil—aber verworfen*. Articles 10, 11, 13, 14 are admitted with some explanatory additions; *adjicitur—admonenda tamen*. The only articles of the twenty-one which are altogether rejected, are the last two, 20 and 21, where the Lutheran doctrines on Faith and Good Works, and on the Invocation of the Saints are disowned; *improbatur, penitus rejiciendus—verworfen*. After this brief exposition, from which it appears that the greater number of the twenty-one articles are not so much statements of specially Protestant or Lutheran doctrines, as rather of the common faith of Christendom, from the earliest ages, the papists proceed to review the main body of the articles, that is, the last seven, or specially Protestant articles. These treat professedly on “points contested;” they are designed to set forth Lutheran principles as distinguished from those of Popery, and the Confutation now adopts a different tone; it had treated the Protestants respectfully, but it now becomes somewhat sar-

caustic and abusive. Before Cochläus, the bitter foe of the Lutherans, proceeds in his summary to particulars, he says of the aggregate of the last seven articles, that in this division of the Confession "no part is admitted, for they (the Protestants) call those things 'abuses' which *are not abuses*."* These seven articles are accordingly rejected (*rejiciendum, verworfen*) without any compunctions of conscience—the old abuses are defended, unholy doctrines re-affirmed, divine truth is suppressed, and very significant language is employed at the close, intimating that if the Protestants will not recant, and solemnly reject the "impious doctrines" of these seven articles, as well as express their general agreement (in the 21) with the ancient faith, the emperor will proceed judiciously against them, supported by the whole force of the empire. Somewhat later, but also during the year 1530, it was proposed to make a new attempt to secure a union of the two parties. Eckius, the popish Goliath, was directed by the Cardinal of Mayence and George of Saxony, to subject the Augsburg Confession to a re-examination, with a view to submit a basis for the proposed union (Salig 289). His report (*Bedenken*, given by Chytræus 173. B) coincides with the above, deals gently with the twenty-one articles, but declares

* The reader may perhaps remember that about two or three years ago, an anonymous pamphlet, styling itself "Definite Synodical Platform," troubled the Lutheran Church in the United States for a short season, until the good sense of the church permitted it quietly to retire to an honored grave. A preliminary "Note," which, like a papal brief or decretal, was designed to regulate the Church, and instruct it respecting the most appropriate mode of abandoning its history and its early faith, speaks with great satisfaction of the fact that while the Platform has succeeded in expunging three-fourths of the Confession as having no pretension to the rank of fundamental doctrines, it was not compelled to add a single sentence to it. This Platform, adopting sentiments similar to those of Cochläus, like him highly disapproves of the seven Protestant articles, and presents quite a respectable "list of symbolic errors rejected" by it. The "entire mass" of the seven articles, and of the "other former symbols," is cast out without mercy. A commentary was published about the same time, which in Part I. "Articles of the Confession," completely ignored the seven articles, inasmuch as the Platform had not admitted them, and very curiously represents the elector and other Lutherans, on p. 339, as signing only twenty-one articles, "*as all they had to say*—Dies ist fast die Summa, &c." The whole belongs more to the region of poetry than of history or theology. Cochläus, who objected on different grounds, was like his contemporary Popish brethren, compelled to recognize the existence of the seven articles—the Platform, under more propitious circumstances, quietly passes them over. In each case an attempt is made to stifle the life-principles of Protestantism.

that an agreement is scarcely possible, if the seven articles "on the abuses" are not withdrawn by the Lutherans.

These historical facts plainly reveal the great thought which the Reformers were solemnly bound to embody in their Confession—namely, an unequivocal declaration that they could not continue to be both Christians and Papists, and that duty to God required them to discard the errors which the ignorance of the middle ages had allowed to combine themselves with the Christian faith. Indeed, if the Augsburg Confession had terminated with the twenty-first article, the emperor could have, with the utmost propriety, addressed them at the Diet in the following language: If these points of doctrine, in which it is conceded, that with a few exceptions, we do not differ materially from you,—if these points of doctrine constitute your *sole objections* to the Catholic system, why have you withdrawn from the communion of the church, renounced its traditions, usages and forms of worship, restored the cup in the Eucharist, allowed the marriage of priests, rejected auricular confession, disowned the obligation of monastic vows, denied the authority of councils, popes and bishops, circulated the Scriptures among the laity, and proceeded as if you had introduced a system of faith which admitted of no compromise with that of the church of Rome? Does a single article of the twenty-one condemn our masses for the dead, or allow all, without exception, to contract marriage, or disapprove of auricular confession to the priest as it is practised among us, and of the penances which he enjoins, or convict our traditions of error, deny the merit of the monastic life, or call in question the powers which the church has, through her bishops, always exercised? Why do you convulse all Europe with your innovations, when you can allege nothing in your own vindication save a few doctrines, in which you generally agree with the ancient church and the church of our own day?

John, who was himself a sagacious prince, was surrounded by wise and far-seeing counsellors; Luther and his theological school clearly understood the merits of the great question which agitated the public mind. The Lord was pleased to impart to these holy men the wisdom and the strength which the emergency demanded. Their proper course was now fully revealed. That they were Christians and not Jews, Turks or pagans, was demonstrated by the seventeen Swabach articles. But the papers which Luther and his associates had prepared in Wittenberg and presented at Torgau, contained precisely

the matter for which the present occasion called. Therein it was demonstrated that the church of Rome of that day had really become a foul and corrupt institution, that it had extinguished the light of the Gospel by the many abuses which it sanctioned, and which the apostles had in part predicted (2 Thess. 2: 3—12; 1 Tim. 4: 1—3), that its practices were at variance with fundamental Gospel principles, and that, where such popish errors were tolerated, the religion of the Bible, to which they were diametrically opposed, could find no home. Accordingly, after Melancthon had revised the seventeen articles, added one on Faith and Good Works from the materials before him, and made some other changes, which were approved, he obtained twenty-one articles; to these he added several remarks: that these doctrines are all taught in the Word of God, that the controversy, however, referred principally to abuses and traditions, &c. After reaching this point, he digested the other Wittenberg or Torgau papers, whence he obtained seven extended articles, forming the main body of the document; he connected this part with the former, by remarking that the reasons should now be given which led the Reformers to correct various ecclesiastical abuses; he then marshals the seven articles with admirable skill, and avails himself of all the aid which his colleagues can afford. In the conclusion he says: "These are the principal articles which are regarded as controverted;" he could easily describe other abuses, he says, several of which he specifies, but he regards the matter now presented, as a sufficiently full exhibition of the spirit of Protestantism.—*And thus it came to pass that out of the vast mass of religious truths in the Scriptures, the Augsburg Confession selected precisely those which we now find in its twenty-eight Articles.**

* The entire "Unaltered Augsburg Confession" exists in two English translations, appended to the translation of Luther's Small Catechism; the one is published by Mr. Henry Ludwig, of New York city, who has rendered such valuable services to the Church by his various publications; the other was published in Philadelphia by Messrs. Lindsay and Blakiston, for the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Pennsylvania. The utility of these two small publications—the only two complete translations of the whole of the German Catechism and Confession, which the English church possesses—has secured for them a wide circulation. Neither pretends to do more than furnish a simple version of the original German. The Confession is preceded in the original by an address to Charles V., from which we have quoted above; as it possesses chiefly a historical interest, it has been omitted by both of the English translations just mentioned. The whole, however, in all its fulness, together with all the

No method could have been more judiciously devised for exhibiting the Lutheran faith in its power, fulness and divine beauty, than the one which the Augsburg Confession adopts. It selects several of the grossest abuses which prevail—it demonstrates irrefragably that these and all other practical errors of the church of Rome had proceeded from Pelagian and other noxious doctrines, which, while they ascribed virtue and merit to man and his works, essentially obscured the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith, and detracted essentially from the honor due to the Savior. Never before had so glorious a confession of pure Bible doctrine, so consistent, so full, and so pure, been made—never had the doctrine of Justification been exhibited to the world since the apostolic age, in this sublime concrete form—in its comprehensiveness and vital power—in its whole tendency to glorify the Redeemer. And therefore, *every attempt to sever these seven articles from the preceding twenty-one, and to suppress them, is equivalent to a renunciation of the whole spirit of Protestantism*, and a virtual endorsement of some of the vilest errors of Popery; for it is by these seven that the whole character of the Augsburg Confession must be judged.

One of the most recent writers on this general subject, E. F. Leopold, in an extended article on the Augsburg Confession, in Herzog's Real-Encykl. I. 607, incidentally expresses the same view. After referring to the happy adaptation of the seven articles to the peculiar wants of the times, he introduces the following reflection: "Although the antagonistic position which the Augsburg Confession assumed (in the last seven articles) inflamed the rancour of the Papists anew, it was precisely this negatory position of the Confession of Faith (which, namely, gave the condemnatory name of "abuses" to long cherished customs) that was of most importance, and produced the weightiest results; the fullest light was now for the first time shed by it on the Reformation, and it at once

other Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church, may be found in the English translation of the "Book of Concord, &c.," published, with other excellent works, by the enterprising Messrs. Henkel—2d edition, New Market, Va., 1854—to which volume we refer the reader. We are not aware of the existence of any other readily accessible publication containing a complete English translation of the "unaltered Augsburg Confession." We may yet direct attention to another very valuable publication of Mr. Ludwig—The unaltered Augsburg Confession, &c., with an Introduction and copious notes by C. H. Schott, translated from the German. The text of the Augsburg Confession is the same with the one given in Mr. Ludwig's edition of the Catechism.

secured for that Reformation a large number of friends and adherents. For it now became apparent to all that the Reformers had no other object in view save that of returning to the original doctrines of Christ and the apostles, and, in strict conformity to them as the sole standard, to cut off every human appendage to scriptural doctrine, and extirpate every hierarchical excrescence of the Church. At the same time, this pure exposition, presented in a popular form, refuted all those slanderous charges which popish malice had disseminated in Germany and other countries."

An incident occurred, a few days after the public presentation of the Augsburg Confession, on June 25, which fully demonstrates its adaptation to the times and circumstances, when we read it in its wholeness, and not in a mutilated form. During the following week the popish theologians had completed one of the several Confutations to which we have already referred. They were seriously embarrassed, both by the twenty-one articles, since these were, as they confessed, "almost all *Christian* articles," and also by the seven, which were so thoroughly scriptural, and so inseparably interwoven with fundamental Christian doctrines, that as they were conscious, the rejection of the seven exposed them to the charge of rejecting the Gospel itself. They accordingly solicited the emperor to inquire of the Protestants, whether these twenty-eight articles (which they found to be invulnerable) were *all* that they desired to present, or whether they were not disposed to offer others, which, as it was signified to them, would yet be received. Spalatin relates the circumstance (Altb. ed. V. 160, and Salig, p. 255); Chytræus (p. 98) furnishes the documents. John and his Lutheran associates held a consultation, and then replied to the imperial messengers in writing, as follows: That many other abuses existed, it was true, in doctrine, church government, &c., which had not been specified in the Augsburg Confession, but that for the sake of avoiding prolixity, and in the spirit of forbearance, they had contented themselves with a statement of the most grievous errors only—that, nevertheless, the twenty-eight articles were really sufficient, as their whole spirit and tenor militated against every unsound doctrine and every abuse (*dadurch widerfochten*). "But if," the Lutherans added, "our opponents adopt these abuses as the expression of their own opinion and sentiment, or if they assail our Con-

fession (in their Confutation) then we are prepared to make a further report on these subjects from the Word of God."

Such were the general views of the Reformers in preparing the first of our Lutheran Symbols or Confessions of Faith. We now obtain the following results: all the materials of which it is composed, written by Luther himself, or else prepared in his presence and adopted by him, were fused together by Melancthon at Augsburg. The ultimate form which the Confession assumed, was fixed by the information which reached the Reformers in that city; but the essential contents were not new creations of Melancthon. The position of John and Luther remained the same; they always had desired to declare that they were Christians, but that they could not belong to the church of Rome, unless it returned to the faith and practice enjoined by God's Word. Such a declaration they now make officially in the Confession, and furnish the reasons for which they intend to adhere to this declaration.

At this point we pause in our historical statements respecting the Augsburg Confession. We have seen the process by which it attained its present shape, and are now placed in a condition to declare that no sound Protestant, who entertains the evangelical views of Luther, can ever consent to an unhallowed disintegration of this Confession—that it forms one undivided whole—and that those parts which constitute essentially its Protestant character, as opposed to the church of Rome, are found in the last seven articles. Another point which the foregoing statement also places in a clearer light than that in which it is sometimes presented, is the following, to which we can here only advert in a few words, without expanding the thought. The Lutheran Church, namely, has already been accused of committing a practical error, by adopting several Symbols of considerable extent; it now receives the following, in addition to the Apostles' Creed, and the two other ancient Creeds: *The Augsburg Confession; The Apology; The Smalcald Articles; Luther's Small Catechism; Luther's Large Catechism; The Formula of Concord.* A general refutation of this charge is furnished by the above. *The Augsburg Confession is not a complete Creed; it is a Protestant Confession, negative rather than positive, that is, rather rejecting popish errors than unfolding the entire Gospel system in an explicit, exhaustive mode.* This latter work was accordingly reserved, in the Providence of God, for the succeeding symbols, each of which added

new statements and illustrations of Bible truth, until the whole divine work was completed by the bounty of God in the noblest of all our Creeds—the Formula of Concord.

We have nearly lost sight of the elector John, while we have been investigating the history of that exalted work—the Augsburg Confession—with which his own honored name is forever connected. He is now entitled to resume his position in the foreground in this sketch. His admirable conduct when the Confession was actually submitted to the diet, next claims attention. We are here, however, anticipated by another writer, Dr. Krauth, Jr., who has already described in the Review (Vol. I. pp. 250—263) the whole scene of the presentation of the Augsburg Confession. To this graphic account we accordingly refer the reader.

The writer just mentioned closes his article with the departure of John from Augsburg, September 23. The refusal of the emperor to invest him in due form with the electoral dignity inherited from Frederic, as well as other harsh measures, had made no impression on the stout heart of John the Constant—he repeatedly declared that he would, under all circumstances, adhere to the cause of evangelical truth. His counsellors, who dreaded the superior power of the emperor, had suggested at Augsburg, that the law of Christian love might justify him in making some concessions to the papists, but he indignantly replied: “I desire that my theologians should pay no regard to me or my political interests, but teach and write the truth with boldness, and not timidly suppress any portion of that truth.” The efforts of the emperor to detach John from the evangelical party by promises and threats, were alike fruitless; his fidelity to the truth was equal to that of the great Reformer himself. The letters of Luther, addressed to John, Melancthon and others, at this period (de Wette IV., beginning of the vol.) are admirable compositions, exhibiting alike his child-like submission to the divine will, and his heroic faith. None of his contemporaries as clearly saw the evil consequences of concessions in matters of faith as he did—he opposed strenuously every “union” which endangered the purity of doctrine, and on one occasion said: “Once for all, I am not at all pleased with these negotiations concerning union in the faith, for that union is impossible, *unless the pope will lay all his popery aside* (wo der Papst sein ganzes Papstthum nicht will abthun).”

It was indeed a noble scene, fit for the pencil of a master, when John uttered the following words, on taking leave of

the emperor, whose military resources were incomparably greater than those of the former, and who felt personally aggrieved by John's constancy: "I am most sure, and am fully persuaded that my Confession and the doctrines contained therein, are so firmly and immovably founded on the Holy Scriptures, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against them." On the 11th of October, he reached his palace in Torgau, and requested Luther to preach in the chapel on the following Sunday. In December the emperor succeeded in securing the election of his brother Ferdinand as King of the Romans, by lavishing immense sums as bribes on five of the electors. John protested against the election, without dreading the imperial frown; the election was a violation of the fundamental law of the empire (the Golden Bull), as well as of the engagements assumed by Charles at his own election. The venal character of the pope was revealed by a curious incident: he sent two official documents, termed *bulls*, to Charles, in one of which John was excluded from the election as a heretic, in the other, his admission was permitted; the pope allowed Charles to use either according to the circumstances, but he suppressed them both.

The Smalcald Alliance, formed in February 1531, was one of the last political events with which John was connected. The energy which he and his associates here exhibited, alarmed Charles and Ferdinand, whose hostile preparations were not yet completed, and the two parties ultimately signed the articles of the Peace of Nuremberg on July 23, 1532. It was the first religious peace acknowledged by the parties; its terms did not grant any new material concessions to the Lutherans, but secured for them temporary repose, and prescribed that all points of difference should be adjusted in harmony and love, at a Church Council to be held in the course of a year from the date of the articles. This peace was equivalent to an imperial and papal recognition of the evangelical Church.

John did not long survive this event. The political and religious agitations of the times had seriously endangered his health at an earlier period. At the beginning of the year 1532, he had been confined by a severe illness, which ultimately affected one of his feet so severely as to render the amputation of the great toe necessary. A letter which he wrote to Luther when he was convalescent, breathes a spirit of holy resignation and trust in God. He afterwards departed from Torgau and spent two days in hunting; he was so suc-

cessful on this occasion, that he became unusually cheerful, and an improvement in his health was indicated. But on the 15th of August he was suddenly attacked by such severe pains in his head, that after several exclamations and appeals to God for relief, he lost his speech; an apoplectic fit supervened, and he lay twenty-eight hours in a state of insensibility. On the next day, when Luther, Melancthon and the physician, Dr. Schurff, entered the chamber of the dying man, the latter, who was now restored to consciousness, attempted to raise his hands and welcome them, but could not succeed, in consequence of excessive debility. Soon afterwards he expired. His death, which occurred August 16, 1532, was calm and peaceful. He had long maintained a living faith in the Redeemer, and his Christian character, by its purity and holiness, reflected honor on his Christian faith. His life, which abounded in the fruits of the Spirit, was a continued exhibition of the power of the grace of God, and his last moments found him prepared to depart. He reached the age of sixty-five years, one month and seventeen days. He was buried, two days after his death, with appropriate funeral honors, and the body placed in the same tomb occupied by the remains of his brother Frederic. Luther who had thrice preached on the death of the latter, delivered two funeral sermons on John, during the course of the week succeeding his death. He selected on these occasions the Epistle of the twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, 1 Thess. 4: 13—18, as his text; Melancthon delivered a discourse in Latin. Both were deeply afflicted by the loss of their faithful friend, whose unwavering fidelity to God and his cause, had endeared him to them, while they unitedly fought the battles of the Lord. Luther said emphatically, in a moment of overwhelming grief: "With Frederic wisdom expired, and godliness with John."

The elector John was characterized, in an unusual degree, by a spirit of devotion, and by a love and fear of God, which seem to have perpetually controlled him. He often occupied six hours on the same day in listening to the reading of portions of the Scriptures; the duty of reading aloud was usually performed by a page, but was also frequently assigned to the princess Maria, his eldest daughter. His happiest hours were those which he passed in communion with God in prayer. He frequently took notes of the sermons which he heard, and made them the subjects of his meditations; a copy of Luther's Small Catechism, which he transcribed with

his own hand, is still preserved in Gotha. The concurrent voice of history concedes that while he occupied a lofty position as an earthly ruler, his humility, zeal, fervor and love, constituted an example of godliness, which was as cheering to the humble believer, as it was glorious to that divine grace from which it derived all its beauty and its power. A very influential position was assigned to him by the Lord at an eventful period in the history of the Church; in all the relations of life he proved himself to be a faithful steward—and if we may judge from his consistent life, his personal acts, his language and the whole spirit which he breathed, we cannot doubt that he was permitted to believe with confidence that the Lord would address to him the words: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant—enter thou into the joy of thy Lord" (Matt. 25: 21).

He was succeeded by his son, JOHN FREDERIC, THE MAGNANIMOUS, the third of the Electors, to whom the title of our article refers. To him also, the Lord was pleased to assign very difficult duties, but, at the same time, to grant sufficient strength and faith to fulfil them. In the darkest hours of his life, when misfortunes seemed to overwhelm him, his Christian virtues shone with increased lustre. We may possibly furnish a sketch of his life in a future article.

ARTICLE II.

TESTIMONY OF JESUS AS TO HIS MEDIATORIAL CHARACTER.

PERHAPS the first question presenting itself to the human mind, in connection with the fact of a future life, is that which has regard to the moral standing of the being, who thus lives on, after physical death, in the sight of God. It is certainly the first in importance; is usually, if not always the first, in the order of time, which presents itself for solution. This remark is, of course, only applicable to those who really believe that they shall live hereafter; or who feel that there is a high probability to this effect; who have been compelled, or induced to look distinctly at this fact, and the evidence by which it commands attention. There are always two disturbing forces interfering with such contemplation;

leading the mind instinctively to shun and turn away from it, to put it away by a violent effort, when the subject presses itself, as it sometimes does, upon human consideration. One of these obstacles is the ghastly fact which lies between earthly and endless existence.

Physical dissolution, *per se*, is an appalling fact, to man as to all other organized beings. By a strange fascination which they cannot entirely resist, but under which they groan and agonize—as seems, for instance, to have been the case with the great moralist of the last century—men are sometimes drawn to this thought, and dwell upon it with morbid apprehension. But not willingly. And they gladly find relief in other things, by which it is put aside and forgotten. Whatever may be said of occasional exceptions, apparent or real, the stupid ox, going stupidly to the slaughter, or the hardened and reckless criminal, dying in empty bravado, the general experience of our race corresponds with that striking statement of the Apostle. They are all their life time subject to bondage. By this very subjection to the fear of death they are paralyzed in their capacity of looking beyond death to the life of which it is the precursor. This, of itself, prevents many from thinking of the subject of immortality, from examining the evidence in its favor; interferes with those clear and decided convictions of which such examination is productive. The repugnance of Louis XIV to the palace of St. Germain, because from that point he could see the towers of St. Denis, where his own remains would be deposited after death, is but one out of the many exhibitions of this natural instinct. An instinct implanted for the wisest purposes; but thus allowed, improperly, to neutralize alike the convictions of conscience and the deductions of reason.

But this is not the only disturbing force in reference to such contemplations. There is another connected with this, acted upon by this, and reacting upon it, in turn, the power of each, by the process, being heightened and intensified. There is an undefined dread, not only of the fact of physical dissolution, but of what that fact may bring with it; a dread of immortality itself, as something which may reveal to the soul infinite disaster; to that soul there is “a fearful looking for of judgment.” We may see the effect in the cause, or we may recognize the cause in the effect. We may say that the sting of death is sin, or the fact that there is a sting in death, proves that there is sin, or we may just take the fact as it is, without any explanation whatever. But that it is a

fact, no honest observer will think of calling in question. The mind of man is not naturally comfortable, in the presence either of death or of what possibly lies beyond death; does not enjoy their contemplation, finds relief in forgetfulness of them, in the absorbing pursuits and thoughts of other objects. To use the thought of the great delineator of humanity, it is not only the sleep of death, but "the dreams which in that sleep may come," that disturb man's conscience and imagination.

But supposing these influences resisted, these obstacles put aside, and the man fairly confronted with this fact of his own, endless being. Live he must and will, through eternity, whatever may be his desires or wishes to the contrary. His existence is felt to be something that cannot be shaken off. God will not, devils, and angels, and men cannot take it away from him. He has forced his unwilling mind and heart up to this issue; is consciously standing before it. The question of questions, under these circumstances to him, is that which has been suggested, that which has reference to his personal standing in the sight of God. "I am going," is the proper reasoning of one under these circumstances, "I am going into eternity; it may be into the immediate presence and under the immediate hand of the Almighty. How do I now stand, and how shall I forever stand before that eternal God, with whose endless existence, for the future, my own runs parallel? Am I now enjoying his favor, or suffering under his displeasure? Have I a satisfactory ground for anticipating this favor for ever? Or are there serious causes for apprehension, for apprehension of his righteous displeasure and the endless consequences of which it must be productive.

To all such enquiries the replies of Scripture are distinct, emphatic and unequivocal. Those replies are substantially contained in two weighty propositions. First, if man be an offender against divine law, he has everything to fear from this fact of endless existence. Secondly, that he is such an offender in nature and in act, and therefore his most fearful apprehensions of futurity are well founded. God, in his essential nature, "is a holy God." In his judicial character, "he will not look upon iniquity but with abhorrence." "The imagination of man's heart, antagonistic to the divine will and character, is evil from his youth." "The heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart, while they live, and after that, as the penalty of this evil and madness, they go to the dead."

Nor do those who are disposed to keep out of Scripture, find more encouraging indications of reply to these questions elsewhere. If there be a God—if there be in the universe a personal Creator, Preserver and Benefactor, infinite in all moral, as well as physical and intellectual perfection, then sin, voluntary opposition to, deviation from, or neglect of this will, is and must be infinitely atrocious and disastrous. All the outward indications of his providence, in the moral, social and physical world, sustain and enforce such inference. The violated law, in any of these provinces of his wide and diversely arranged dominions, brings its own penalty. Reason, conscience and physical nature unite in proclaiming that if there be sin, ruin to its author is wrapped up in it. "Where the carrion" of sin is, "there the vultures" of divine justice "are gathered together."

Not less distinct are the natural evidences of this other fact: that man is actually in this condition of offence and moral ruin. Whatever standard may be selected, that of Christ, of Moses, or of nature, if it be consistently and unshrinkingly applied, it will bring out this appalling result. Given the premises of a supreme and perfect moral Governor, and man his accountable subject and creature, there is not a single requisition of duty to be found in the morality of the Old and New Testament, which does not flow out of these premises, by logical necessity. Reason and conscience unaided, may indeed never draw these inferences. But that does not at all interfere with the fact, that they may be drawn, that reason and conscience ought to do this, and that they would do it if unprevented. And what is most to our present purpose, although reason and conscience unaided, may never form these premises, which they themselves admit, deduce the grand conclusion of supreme love to God, and love to men as brethren, as the proper spring of human action, yet when this conclusion is distinctly presented from without, as in the language of Christ, its propriety is at once admitted. But taking this, or any other standard which claims our respect, it will be found that in almost every particular, man is deficient, has violated in positive act, or failed, by neglect, to obey and honor his Creator. We are not here offering explanations. We are only stating a fact. The whole world of accountable beings is guilty before God. The whole world, in every age of its existence, has confessed the fact; has endeavored to atone for these sins, and to get rid of them.

Man, as a creature of God, tried consistently by any law that claims his respect, is defective in doing what are his duties, does what is positively wrong. And just in proportion to the religious and moral elevation of man, is the depth and clearness of this conviction.

And over against this conviction of sin, to be seen in the confessions of men in past time, is there this other fact, of our endeavor to make atonement for it. And, in making this atonement, there has been always a disposition manifested to find a mediator; some one to stand between the divine judge and the human criminal; to make satisfaction himself, or to render the criminal's atonement and repentance acceptable. So universal is this disposition, that it may be regarded as an instinctive movement of man's moral and religious nature. Like all instincts, this may be, and has been prevented. But in spite of such perversion, it is manifestly based upon some fundamental fact in human nature: upon some truth in the moral universe, to which this fact has correlation. Man asks naturally for a priest. If, like Micah, he can succeed in getting one of the Levitical order, he will avail himself of the opportunity. If this is out of his power, as did Micah at first, he will consecrate some one else. If necessary, as did the Danites, he will take one by fraud and violence. And if no human mediator at all, or by any of these means can be obtained, he will act priest himself, offer his own sacrifice, and regard that sacrifice as the mediating influence between his soul and God. The whole world of accountable beings is consciously and confessedly guilty before God. In the manifestation of this consciousness, in the utterance of this confession, it cries out for a helper. It asks, in tones of agony, for a daysman; one who can intercede with God, one who can say to man: "I have found a ransom."

We are thus brought to our point of enquiry. Christ has been regarded by the great majority of his followers, in every age of Christianity, as occupying this position; as the real and only Mediator, of whom all others were types, shadows, and symbolic prophecies. Such, doubtless, was the opinion of those who professed to receive their doctrine immediately from him; and who are sustained in this statement, by his own declarations. Such manifestly was the opinion of the early church, for centuries. Does this opinion find its sanction in his own recorded teachings? Does he proclaim himself as occupying this position? And if so, what are the specialities of his instruction, with reference to the whole

subject? He is the Lord of life; brings to light, in his Gospel, life and immortality. What is the assurance to sinners, that endless life is not an endless curse? What are the features of his work and character, which give to his people assurance that going into eternity, they are going safely; free from the condemning sentence, from the enslaving thralldom of sin.

A practical reply to these enquiries is suggested in one of the titles assumed by Christ, and frequently applied to him by the inspired Apostles: the Lord of life, the Giver of life, spiritual and eternal. He promises a future physical life to his people. And the fact that he confers upon them a present spiritual life, is adduced as the strongest proof that this promise of life beyond the grave, will receive fulfilment. There is a present moral resurrection; a future physical resurrection. These two forms of resurrection are so connected and blended in his own and the instructions of his Apostles, that it is sometimes difficult to know which constitutes the main thought of the speaker: the word life, indeed, being employed to designate that complex idea which includes not only endless existence, but perfect existence, in duration of course, as in all other respects, of blessedness. Christ is the giver of spiritual life, to one spiritually dead. But this kind of life, to one thus dead, involves pardon to the criminal, dead in the eye of the law, legal permission to this criminal, through this pardon to live. Nor can anything short of this meet the real exigencies of the case. If, for instance, it be supposed that Christ, by his moral teachings and example, work upon the heart and affections, so as to change and purify them in a natural way, or by some supernatural influence, infuse within the sinner the principle of a new life, and eventually bring this life to perfection, still, under such supposition, he has not provided for the first and greatest want of that sinner. That soul, as guilty under legal sentence, first needs pardon. Christ, to give him life, must procure and give him this pardon; legal right to live a single moment in the dominions of the Great King. He must do this unconditionally, in his own sovereign right, leaving his law and word without vindication, or he must do it in such manner as vindicates the law, and deters the sinner and all others from future violation. Until an assurance of pardon, in one or the other of these modes be obtained, that offender can never feel safe. He may be dragged at any moment, and whatever may be his present character or principles, to immediate ex-

ecution. We may say, therefore, in general terms, that Christ's announcement of himself, as the Lord of life, to sinners dead under the law, would seem to imply that, in some manner, he will stand between these condemned criminals and the law of a perfectly just God, under which they are thus condemned. Prior to examination, this seems to be the mode in which life to these dead souls is possible.

And this presumption, or natural anticipation, falls in with the most remarkable fact in Christ's earthly existence: the simple fact of his death. This incident of death, under any form, whether through the agonies of crucifixion, or in the gradual waste of disease and old age, in the experience of an intelligent being, is an inexplicable mystery. It is not the wages of nature, nor will nature ever heartily assent to such an assertion. It is felt to be an outrage upon God's established order of things; the effect of a previous outrage, still more fearful and disorganizing. Regarded as the wages of sin, it is still mysterious. But the most perplexing part of the mystery, under this view of it, is removed. The moral propriety of this connection between sin, the most awful fact to human reason and conscience, and death, the most awful fact to human apprehension, it is easy to recognize. But when one of these facts is seen without the other, when we see sin not followed by death, or death not preceded by sin, the mystery comes back upon us in all its inexplicability. Such is the case in this instance. Christ, in dying in any form, suffered in his own person the penalty of sin, although he himself was perfectly sinless. He owed the law no debt. No wages were due to him as a laborer in the service of sin. And yet, in dying, he paid a debt to the law; received from sin these wages. Death itself constituted this unaccountable transaction: unaccountable as viewed simply with reference to his individual standing before God, and deserts under the divine law. But perfectly consistent with all the natural and revealed principles of the divine government, if this be regarded as the voluntary act of a sinless mediator: paying, in his own death, a debt to the law, which sinners owed, receiving, in this death, the awful wages for which sinners had labored. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things," voluntarily placing himself in this position of mediator between God and man? Ought he, a sinless man, have suffered such things, as standing upon his own standing, and treated according to his own deserts, under a law which he only lived to honor and illustrate?

And as coincident with this line of thought, and confirmatory of the conclusion to which it points forward, is the carefulness of the Lord Jesus to exclude from the minds of his disciples, the supposition that his death was an isolated transaction; that it was the result of mere accidental violence, or unanticipated casualty. He tells of it beforehand. "The son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the Scribes, and they shall condemn him and put him to death." "The son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and the Scribes, and be slain." He tells additionally of the mode of his death; that it would be by crucifixion, a Roman form of punishment, and through a condemnation obtained from the Roman authority. "He shall be delivered to the Gentiles, and shall be mocked and spitefully entreated and spit upon, and they shall scourge him and put him to death." "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the son of man be lifted up." "If I be lifted up, I will draw all men unto me." He speaks of this event as taking place only through his voluntary acquiescence. "I lay down my life of myself." No one *oudest* taketh it from me. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. "Thou wouldst have no power against me unless it were given thee from above." "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels." This great transaction, moreover, to which he voluntarily submits, and becomes a party; which he describes beforehand in these, its varied details, is still further declared to be the central fact of a great scheme of divine operation; one which had been foretold by Old Testament prophecy; one so wrought in with certain predetermined divine counsels and consequences, that it would take place in a certain time; that he would not, and his enemies could not move in this matter, until the hour for it had arrived. "For this purpose came I into this world." "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the son of man, shall be accomplished." "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer." "This that is written, he was numbered among the transgressors, must be fulfilled in me." "But all this has been done that the Scriptures might be fulfilled." "My hour is not yet come," is the statement more than once, during the early periods of his ministry. "Now is the hour and the power of darkness," is his utterance, as his enemies surround him in Gethsemane. None of the passages quoted thus far,

assert in express terms that Christ died as a sacrifice for the sins of men. We have not brought them forward for that purpose. But rather to show the position which this fact of his death is made by him to assume. That position is one of infinite significance. And prior to any special examination of his words, as to its moral efficacy, we shall anticipate that the highest interests of man were in some manner therewith connected. "If I be lifted up, I will draw all men unto me." The son of man must be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on him "thus lifted up," shall have everlasting life." Statements of this kind are well calculated to prepare the mind for some wonderful revelation, in regard to the efficacy and significance of the fact to which they have allusion; annihilate all these puerilities which would explain this fact, by the accidental violence of an excited mob, on the one side, or the mere exhibition of patient suffering and forgiveness on the other. When Christ with loud voice proclaimed: "it is finished," he meant something more than that this was the end of his physical sufferings. It was his great work, of which he was speaking, of which his death was the crowning act and conclusion.

Thus the matter stands, prior to the examination of any distinct utterance of Christ, as to the moral significance of this great transaction. He, the Lord of life, sinless, and therefore under no obligation to die the death of a transgressor, voluntarily submits to such a death. This act he describes as the crowning and completing one, of a great scheme of divine mercy, for the benefit of man: as one foretold in Old Testament prophecy, and by which men, in all coming time, will be drawn to his service. Does he, besides this, let us inquire, give express information as to why it is, that his death is a matter of so much interest? It is conceivable that there might have been existing circumstances, which would have made it improper and inexpedient for him to have gone any further in his personal references to this coming event, and to have left the full explanation to his duly authenticated witnesses. There certainly were circumstances which forbade any detailed and circumstantial information to the multitude, and which made it expedient not to dwell upon it at length, and frequently, even to the chosen circle of the Apostles. Christ's prophecies of his own death, like all other prophecies, must receive their fulfilment through human agency. This human agency must work freely in its own sphere; however unbecomingly or unintentionally it may be

accomplishing results provided for in the counsels of divine wisdom. The prophecy, therefore, whether spoken or written, cannot, and must not be history foredelimited. Even if such detail could have been given, there was a state of mind and heart, which would have interfered with its reception. "I have many things to say unto you," was his language, only the evening before this event of his death, but ye cannot hear them now—even now, although the event is just at hand. Their minds were preoccupied with an altogether different theory of the Messiah and deliverer of Israel. It would have been useless to persons in this state of mind, when the fact itself was one they could not receive: a fact which they would not, for a long time, believe; which they struggled against as long as possible; and which, after all, and in spite of his declarations, took them by surprise. The manner in which the multitude received the intimation of such an event, as described in the sixth chapter of John, and the mode in which it was met by Peter, after his noble confession, will show some of the difficulties connected with any instruction upon this point, until after the event actually took place. From the nature of the case, we could only expect it in the form of incidental allusions: allusions obscure to those who heard them, but fully explained in the light of the fact to which they had reference.

An examination, however, of some of these allusions, will show more clearly the nature of his instructions upon this point. One of the most striking is that to which allusion has just been made; the statements of the sixth chapter of St. John. The reader is, of course, aware that the area, so to speak, of this chapter, has, since the Reformation, been the great battle-ground of the Sacramental controversy. Into that controversy, however, it is not at all necessary just here to enter, or even, in regard to it, to express an opinion. For the purposes of our argument, the interpretation of the Romanist and the Protestant, alike bring us to the same conclusion. Whether with the Protestant, we say that Christ is speaking of his flesh once given, and his blood once shed for the life of the world, or whether we say with the Romanist, that he is speaking of this same sacrifice, constantly repeated in the Sacrament, until the end of time, the fact itself of such sacrifice is necessarily implied. "I am the living bread," says he, "which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for *inip* the life of the

world." Similar in meaning is that statement, in the tenth chapter of the same Gospel. "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." And then further on, as if to show that he was not merely speaking of what any good shepherd would do, under certain circumstances, but of what would actually take place in his own personal experience, he adds: "as the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep. And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall be one fold and one shepherd. Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, and because I take it again. No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." "Now," says he, soon after these last statements, and manifestly referring, and understood by those around, to be referring to his death, "now is the judgment," the condemning judgment "of this world, now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." "This," adds John, "he said signifying what death he should die." "The people answered," showing that he was understood by them to refer to this event of his death, "the people answered him, we have heard out of the law that Christ abideth forever," will not die at all, "and how sayest thou, the son of man must be lifted up? Who is this son of man?" If you, the son of man, are going to die, and draw all men unto you, how can you be the Messiah of whom it is prophesied that he will not die, but "abide forever." The resurrection, of course, solved this difficulty. But whether thus solved or not, the connection of dependence between the life of the world and his death, is clearly brought to our view in these declarations. He gives his flesh, that is, he dies for the life of the world; that a world of condemned creatures, already dead in the eye of the law, may again live, not only physically but morally.

But there are additional statements, in which this fact of Christ's death, as an atoning sacrifice for sin, is still more clearly presented. There are, first of all, the general declarations to the effect that his work is a saving one; that it was not merely to reveal a purer standard of duty than already existed, but to save those who, tried either by the old or the new standard, were already condemned. "The son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost." "The son

of man did not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world," already lost, "through him might be saved." "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." All these passages proclaim the fact of man's ruin and Christ's salvation; that to save man, already lost and ruined, not merely or mainly to teach or set him an example, was Christ's great undertaking. And not only in those already quoted, but in others, we are told how this salvation was accomplished. The son of man would not only save the world, but he would save it in his death, by being lifted up, the serpent in the wilderness being typical, not only of his work, but of the very mode in which it would take place. As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. "This," says he, on the night before he died, "this is my body which is given for you." "This is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things." "It behooved Christ to suffer." "The son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." "The hour is come," is his language in connection with a passage already referred to, "the hour is come in which the son of man must be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." "Father save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour." "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished." These passages, all having reference to his death, of suffering, not only present it as the central fact of his work, for man's benefit, but as thus so, in view of its expiatory character. It is his blood of the new covenant, shed for many for the remission of sins; his life, given as a ransom for many; his body given for his people's redemption; his flesh, exposed to agony and death, for the life of the world. Let the reader thoughtfully re-peruse these words of Jesus, bearing in mind not only their manifest meaning, as it lies upon the surface, but what must have been their signification to his Jewish hearers, whose minds were familiarized with the idea of sacrifice for sin, and he will have no difficulty in understanding

where the Apostles got their doctrine of Christ crucified; why it was that one of them determined to know no other; found in it his only ground of boasting or reliance. "God hath made him who knew no sin to be sin for us." "God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation for our sins," will be recognized as assertions finding their authority, as well in Christ's own words, as in those acts and sufferings of Christ by which these words were illustrated.

But while it is thus satisfactory to look for, and to find, in the very words of the Master, a revelation of his atoning sacrifice for sin, it is scarcely less so, to trace this revelation, as in other forms it comes before us in his instruction. From the nature of the case, as we have already seen, full instruction as to the meaning and efficacy of Christ's death, could only be given after it had actually taken place. The fact itself, the disciples would not receive; struggled against it as long as possible; and the multitude, by any allusion to it, were immediately offended. Any utterance in regard to it, must come out incidentally, as suggested by passing occurrences, and be left for its full explanation to the event when it actually occurred. Such we find to have been the course really pursued. The passages, for instance, already adduced, do not form part of connected discourses addressed to the multitude, as was the sermon on the mount, or many of the parables. They are rather put forth incidentally. Most of them were utterances to the inner circle of the disciples, the people not being present. And those of them that were uttered before the people, were suggested by some passing occurrence. In this way the properly disposed were gradually prepared for this wonderful transaction, which was to revolutionize everything; were gradually prepared, not only for this wonderfully unanticipated and offensive fact, but for its understanding; to recognize in it, although full of folly to the Greek, and offence to the Jew, the highest manifestation of divine goodness and wisdom.

And yet there were other modes in which such preparation was made; other modes in which Jesus actually made preparation. It will not be aside from the purposes of our argument, to develop this plan of preparation. Placing ourselves as far as possible in the position of the contemporaries of Jesus, or of men in any age, to whom this doctrine of our atoning Savior was about to be revealed, what, let us inquire, would seem to be the most natural mode of preparation? Would it not be just that which is pursued by the wise and

skilful minister of Christ, in every age of the world, and to all classes of men; convincing them of their need of such an atoning Savior for their sins, and the offering of their divine evidence, after this conviction has been produced, that such a Savior has been actually provided? We do not presume to say that divine wisdom could not adopt any other plan. But certainly this seems to be adapted to the exigencies of the case in question.

And this was actually the course adopted by the Lord Jesus. The whole drift and substance of his instruction, was to magnify the law of God and make it honorable; to show its sacredness and infinite purity; to show that through this law there was no hope to the sinner. The age, and the men of that particular community, needed a moral quickening, which would enable them to see their need of an atoning Savior, and from this sense of need, too look for and to find him, as revealed in the events of his life, and in the previously misunderstood messages of Old Testament prophecy. It was, therefore, the work of the Master, and of his great forerunner, the Baptist, to break up the fallow ground of national pride and self-conceit; to show that the lineal children of Abrahams, if not like Abraham in character, were children of wrath. And this they did by exhibiting the law in the full extent of its demand upon human affection and action. The moral teaching of the three years ministry of Jesus is, as it were, a concentration and spiritualization of the whole force and substance of Old Testament morality. Through that law, thus vitalized and expounded, is the knowledge of sin; that thorough conviction of personal deficiency, of guilt, of depravity and helplessness, which finds its natural utterance in the cry for a deliverer; that cry which Paul puts in the mouth of all who are in this condition: "O wretched man, who shall deliver me from the body of this death!"

It is, therefore, not only relevant to the object of this argument, but a matter of deep interest, to notice the modes in which this work of preparation went on, in the instructions of the Master. One mode of getting rid of Christ's mediatorial character, as a personal Savior, making atonement and interceding with God for sinners, has been that of insisting upon his character as a moral teacher; of making even his sufferings a part of his teachings, in the way of example. Now there can be no question as to the fact that Christ is the Great Teacher—the Great Teacher, by example as well as by precept—and that his people are told to imitate him,

even in the example of his meek endurance of suffering for the welfare of others. But granting all that may be urged in this respect, insisting upon it much more strenuously than those do, who are so fond of bringing it forward, do these persons see where, if consistently followed, their own doctrine will lead them? You say that Christ is a moral teacher. So do we. And we affirm that every word of his teaching, and every act of his life, in the way of example, is a revelation of the absolute necessity to man, as a sinner, of an atoning Savior. If by the law, was the knowledge of sin, how must this knowledge have been purified and enlarged in the light of that law, as illustrated and perfectly exemplified by Christ Jesus. If the sinner has no hope, under the imperfect standards of nature, and of Moses, what can be this hope, tried upon his own merits, by the higher standard of Christ's precepts and example? It is a noticeable fact, in regard to some of the more distasteful doctrines of the New Testament, that the modes of getting rid of these doctrines, frequently bring them back in a more positive form, if possible, than usually stated. By way, for instance, of getting rid of the doctrine of endless punishment, and of the fact that the punishment of the wicked and the life of the righteous are described by the same adjective of duration, it has been urged that this adjective is not confined, in its significance, to the idea of duration, that it means perfect life in the case of the righteous, perfect death in the case of the wicked; which, of course, involves the very fact to be gotten rid of, endless duration, as one of the necessary attributes of this perfect moral life or death; the argument really being an attempt to show from the assertion of a whole, that one of its parts has no existence. So, again, in regard to the distasteful doctrine of human depravity, we are sometimes told that it is only the gloomy dream of haters of their kind, that men sin not as depraved beings, having a strong natural tendency so to do, but through force of evil example, or through deficiency of proper instruction; which, of course, if it were true, would only make the acts of sin more atrocious and inexcusable. So, again, in this particular instance, Christ is a perfect moral teacher; of course, therefore more perfectly to exhibit to sinful man his deficiency, and guilt, and helplessness. And yet, strange as it may seem, and as showing the inconsistency of the human mind, we find these very persons, who see in Christ only a moral teacher, and who ought, in the light of his teaching and example, to see sin in all its enormity; we

find these very persons extenuating this awful fact of sin, and almost, at times, denying its very existence. The very word by which offences against God are described in the Bible, *sin*, is banished from this vocabulary. And Christ, the great revealer of sin by contrast with himself and his precepts, is presented under such an aspect as to make out sin to be a trifle. Regarding Christ, therefore, as a revealer of the law, that by this revelation men might be led to him, as a Savior from the curse and condemning sentence of the law, in other words, looking upon his moral teaching as preparatory to the work of his atonement, let us trace the steps by which this preparation was made. It will be seen that, so far from weakening, his moral precepts confirm every utterance, as to the atoning efficiency of his work and sufferings.

One of the first steps in this process, and one of no little interest, not only to his cotemporaries, but in its bearing upon questions that have since arisen, is his distinct and emphatic authentication of the Old Testament Scriptures, as inspired and of divine authority. "The Scriptures cannot be broken." "What saith the law? How readest thou?" These are the questions by which he sends his hearers, whether friends or enemies, to the Old Testament Scriptures. "Thou knowest the commandments," of Moses' law, of course. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." "The Scriptures testify of me." "If ye believed Moses, ye would believe in me, for he wrote of me." "It is *written* that the son of man must suffer." "The son goeth as it is *written* of him." "The *Scriptures* must be fulfilled." "All things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished." "Thus it is *written*, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer." "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." "This that is written, he was numbered among the transgressors, must be accomplished in me."

And as the Lord Jesus thus authenticated the Old Testament, as a whole, so is this authentication specially emphatic in reference to its moral system. His first public utterance contains an assertion to this effect. "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness—to meet every requisition, inward and outward, alike of the righteous law of God." We do not stop to show how much more this language means—to notice the claim it involves of an ability to do—what to mere man is impossible. We simply bring it forward as showing the position of Christ to the moral law, as its firm upholder.

"Which of you convicteth me of sin," was his challenge, once thrown out to his infuriated opponents. Which one of you is able to lay his finger upon the precept in my doctrine, the word of my mouth, or the act of my life, which will afford ground of such conviction? Of course, that law of Moses, to which they appealed, and the purity of which he upheld, was the common standard, to which this challenge had regard. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil," to fill out, to complete, to perfect. "I am come to expound the law as to its meaning, to show what it really does mean; to establish it more firmly as to its authority; to fulfil, or comply with it in all its demands; to fulfil it, by actualizing all its types, and by bringing to pass all its prophetic declarations." "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." And then follows his own exposition of that law, showing that it goes to the very foundation of human action: that it covers human life in all its movements, and in every moment; and that in every such moment, and in all these movements, the sanctifying principle of love must and can alone render the obedient effort, an act acceptable. Christ, merely as a moral teacher, leaves human nature in a much more hopeless condition than he finds it. He widens an area of duty, already too wide for human capacity, without at all increasing that capacity for compassing it. But Christ, as a moral teacher, convincing men of sin, breaking up the court of carnal security, letting in the light of heavenly purity upon the darkness of carnal self-delusion, is seen to be preparing men for their reception of him, as an atoning Savior. The law, in his hands, becomes the pedagogue, by which the docile pupil is led, in a proper state of the heart, to receive from him, not only instruction, but salvation. Under this view, everything falls in its proper place, and Christ's whole life is seen to be a preparation for that which he asserts to be its crowning act and completion—his death and sufferings "as a ransom for many." Thus by his life, and by his death, he magnified the law, and made it honorable. And yet made it possible for a transgressor to be saved, under that law, without any of its demands being abated, or without offenders being encouraged to continue in transgression.

But the Lord Jesus, in the language already referred to, does not merely confirm and authenticate Old Testament morality, and in so doing, show man's need of a Savior from sin. His language clearly includes the typical and prophetic position of the Old Testament, and with similar bearing upon this fact of his atoning sacrifice. We have used the terms types and prophecies, in accordance with common usage, as if expressive of different ideas. Perhaps it would simplify the matter to say prophecies, whether by word or typical representation. The types of the Old Testament had a present signification. But that present signification was prophetic of a future one. As has been said of the sacrament of Baptism, they were "symbols of a symbol." They symbolized outward purification, this symbolizing and purification of an inward and moral character. And both pointed forward to the great purifying sacrifice, by which the soul of man is cleansed from pollution. When Jesus, therefore, proclaimed that he came to fulfil *τα ρηματα*, to fill out, to complete, to perfect the law and the prophets, he meant to express much more than the idea of sustaining and enforcing the law, in all its moral requisitions. His language includes this idea. But it at the same time, goes beyond it. The law was not only a system of morality, but also an economy, through which temporary provision, at least, was made for the relief or the punishment of certain classes of offenders, against these its moral precepts. The offender, in certain cases, must make atonement for his sin, by the life of an animal, in a sacrificial offering. In certain other cases, of great atrocity, his own life was the forfeit. Besides these individual sacrifices, there were others, morning and evening duty for the whole people; and a special and very solemn day set apart every year, for atonement to be made by the High Priest, for the sins of the whole congregation of Israel. "To fill out," or to "perfect the law," to "keep its least, as well as its great commandments," "to fulfil all righteousness," as Jesus declared was his object, it would be necessary that this part of the Old Dispensation should not be passed over or neglected. He certainly did not complete or perfect it, as he did the moral law, by adding to it; by increasing its details, or by giving fuller instruction in reference to its rites and ceremonies. And, in a very few years, under the sanction of his own Apostles, and as we find out incidentally, in spite of their own feelings and prepossessions, the whole machinery of the Mosaic ceremonial went into desuetude. We are therefore compelled to look for some

other explanation of this language, to find some other mode in which, according to his own promise, he filled out this feature of the old economy. And we find one perfectly satisfactory, in the fact of his death as an atonement for sin; the realization of all the legal types and symbols of atonement for sin, the fulfilment of all the Old Testament prophecies, having reference to the same great transaction. "These," says Jesus to the Apostles just before his ascension, "these are the words that I spoke unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures. And said unto them, thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise again the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins in his name," his work and death, as the reality, having superseded the old symbolic mode, in which repentance and remission were acceptable," should be preached among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." "Behold," said the great forerunner of Jesus, "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." And Jesus tells us afterwards, that John's testimony is true. Clearly in this language of John, do we recognize the true sacrificial lamb, divinely appointed to take away the sins of men."

Nor is it any reply to this, to say, as is sometimes said, that all these ideas of expiation, of atonement for sin, of satisfaction for sin, are peculiarly Jewish conceptions; that, in all such conceptions, we see the "dark shadow of the Hebrew God," a shadow which it was the object of Christ's moral teaching to remove, as well from the human mind as from the divine character. Assertions of this kind may have weight with those who regard the Old and New Testament as coming from different authors, or as having different objects in view. But they have none whatever to those who will take Christ's word for it, that they constitute one organic whole, and that he and his work constitute their subject matter; in the Old Testament as being prepared for, in the New, as actually taking place. If holiness and justice constitute the dark shadow of the Hebrew God, that shadow becomes darker still, in the sermon on the mount, in the parables, in the condemning life and in the atoning death of his well beloved son. It is the peculiar glory and beauty of Christ's atoning work, that it makes manifest the fact, that this shadow does not rest upon God; that it is one which the sinner himself creates,

that holiness and justice, so long full of dread and of gloom, to the human soul are full of light, and brightness, and beauty, as much so as are benevolence and wisdom; that in every attribute, "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." There was a time when the expiatory character of the Old Testament sacrifices was denied; when the assertion was put forth that they were only thank-offerings, expressions of devotion or gratitude. This notion could only, however, maintain a brief existence. And the plea of Jewish conceptions, which would degrade the Old Testament, and disconnect it from the New, is now a favorite mode of putting aside this evidence of Christ's atoning character. But, as we have seen, this plea is really of no advantage to the purpose for which it is employed. You say that this idea of mediation between sinful man and a holy God, of mediation by means of a propitiatory sacrifice, is a Jewish one. No doubt it is. And it is a heathenish one too; not, however, on that account necessarily false. Such universal prevalence of it, may be proof of its being founded in primeval truth. But whether so or not, it is as asserted, most undeniably Jewish. Judaism is full of it; cannot consistently hang together without it. Such being the case, Christ has put his seal of approval upon it. According to him, the fact that a thing is Jewish, is part of the Mosaic institute, so far from being against that thing, is in its favor; is evidence of its having been divinely established. While he condemns Rabbinism, the curse then as now of the Jewish intellect—note the distinction, for it is a very important one—the sophism of the argument we have been looking at, consists in the play upon the two words as identical; while he condemns Rabbinism, he everywhere authenticates and endorses genuine Old Testament Judaism, Mosaicism. He asserts that he came to fulfil them, the prophecies, in type and symbol, as well as in word. Or, as we have already urged, that all these were established to familiarize the Jewish and the human mind with certain ideas and principles, in the light of which his work was prepared for, and by which, after being actually performed, it could be understood. In this his atoning work, all these stated prophecies of Judaism, daily, weekly and yearly repeated, received fulfilment. Judaism itself, as a system, constituting, as it were, one great organic frame-work of prophecy, silent, yet impressive, received like fulfilment.

And as the symbolic prophecies of Judaism were thus endorsed by Christ, and thus, under his authority, became evidence as to the nature of his work, so also, do the prophecies in word, under like endorsement, fall in with the same line of evidence. Only a few of these need be referred to. Two of them are alluded to by Christ himself, as inspired prophecies; one of them in the way of general reference, the other as having application to his death. With a brief examination of these, we close our argument.

"This," says Christ, the night before his crucifixion, and speaking of his death, "this that is written, he was numbered among the transgressors, must be fulfilled in me." Here is a prophecy, which Christ tells us has reference to himself, to his death. Now what is the substance of that prophecy? What bearing has it upon this enquiry, as to the whether that death is an atoning work, for human transgression? We need only turn to it, to have every doubt removed from our minds. It is that wonderful fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, which reads so much as if it were penned after the events of which it speaks had taken place, more than five hundred years after the prophet had been consigned to the grave. "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare his generation? For he was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was he stricken. Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his land. He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death; and he was numbered among the

transgressors; and he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." There are slight variations of phraseology, that might be suggested in the translation of these verses, by which some of the facts in connection with Christ's death, are seen to be more exactly delineated. But the great fact of an atonement for sin, comes up in too many forms, and is too clearly stated, to be obscured by any translation deserving the name. And if the reader will bear in mind that Christ himself tells us that this prophecy has reference to his death, he will see its bearing upon the question under discussion: as to whether that death was an atonement for sin. If still unconvinced, we suggest to him the experiment of framing some clearer or stronger mode, or form of words in which this fact can be stated. And if, in case of failure, he comes to the conclusion that he will not receive such a doctrine, however or by whomsoever stated, he is, of course, neither upon our premises, nor within range of our conclusion. He may, however, ascertain what he had never before suspected, the real facts of his own position—rejection of all revelation—logical Atheism.

But to other classes of readers, we say this prophecy does not stand alone. There is another, which, like this, comes, not only under Christ's general authentication of the Old Testament, as a whole, and in its three great divisions, "the law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms," but through his express reference to it, as a portion of these inspired Scriptures. We allude to the prophecy of Daniel. Portions of this prophecy are obscure, and it has been the favorite battle-ground of contending forces. We do not enter upon the chronological question. Neither, again, do we take part in the discussion, as to whether the latter of it is fulfilled, or still fulfilling. We simply call attention to the fact, that we here meet with the person of the Messiah, that he is cut off, that he shall be thus cut off, not for himself, and that in connection with the cutting off or offering of him the great sacrifice, the typical sacrifices and oblations came to an end. Let this ninth chapter of Daniel be read in the light of the fifty-third of Isaiah, and both of them in the light of the Messiah's life and death, and of his own express declaration that they are inspired prophecies, and it will be seen that there is one pervading idea with them all. An idea presented in Christ's own words: "the son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost." "The son of man came not

to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

And with these as our leaders, we see more clearly the meaning of many others of these inspired prophecies. We can understand those allusions to a suffering Messiah, occurring in the book of Psalms. We can see what is meant by Zechariah, when he speaks of "the prisoners being sent forth by the blood of the covenant," "of the smitten shepherd," of "the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness," of Israel "looking upon him whom they have pierced," and of "the great mourning" which will follow upon conviction of this national transgression. We can look back through all these, to the first prophecy of all, and can see what is meant by that promise of a deliverer, who, through suffering, should bruise and overcome man's great enemy and tempter. And in the fact of a bloody sacrifice, which so soon followed, and which was accepted, rather than one of another character, we received an intimation that this first promise, if not fully understood, was, at least, connected with an institution which prepared the way for such an understanding. This fact, moreover, that the second man born into the world, offered such a sacrifice, and that it was accepted, constitutes a partial explanation of something already alluded to: the prevalence of atoning sacrifices, and the ideas connected with them, not only among the Jews, but among the heathen. The hope of all nations was thus never entirely out of their sight. His death, in the silent prophecy of type and symbol, alike among Jews and Gentiles, was constantly foreshadowed.

We have thus traced the various steps by which the Lord Jesus prepared the minds of his followers for this feature of his work and character; the mode in which he opened their minds to understand the Scriptures, in which the work was already revealed; to understand this work more fully in the light of its actual accomplishment. Beautifully complete is the process, as it thus comes before us. The record of Old Testament prophecy and revelation, alike closes with the announcement of the coming of the great angel of the covenant of the Lord, whom they were seeking; of the approach of his forerunner in spirit and power of Elijah. For four hundred years that promise waits fulfilment, and the heavenly voice is silent, as to when that fulfilment can be expected. This four hundred years' silence is at last broken. The lonely forerunner in the solitudes of Judea, proclaims that the kingdom of heaven was at hand; in other words, that the long

promised, and expected hope of Israel, the Messiah, Son of David, was about to be manifested. Subsequently he proclaims his presence, then points him out, then declares him to be the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world:" all along insisting upon repentance on the part of his hearers; this demand implying the necessity of a moral preparation, which they, as yet, had not for this Messiah's reception. Jesus himself takes up this burden of John's message; demands repentance for sin, faith in the Gospel which he was revealing. He distinctly endorses John's teaching in regard to himself; points him out as revealed in Old Testament prophecy. This attestation of John, the preacher of repentance, Jesus follows up by his exposition of the law, in its spirituality; thus shows, not only the necessity of that repentance upon which both he and John had first insisted, but of an all-sufficient Mediator, to render this repentance acceptable. In connection with this spiritual exposition of the moral law, he brings to view the fact, that he came not only to establish it, but fulfil it; to fulfil all righteousness, to fill out and actualize all of its types and symbols; to bring to pass all the Old Testament prophetic declarations. These general declarations of fulfilling what was written, are specially accumulated in reference to the fact of his death; that great event which he describes as the crowning fact of his work, "as the ransom for many," as the lifting up which would draw all men unto him. And after this death has taken place, and the disciples are able, in the light of the resurrection, to see its full significance, then the instruction which previously they had not been able to bear, is imparted. They are made to see that "Christ ought to suffer," "that it behooved him so to do;" in other words, that there was a moral propriety, a moral necessity, that in taking upon himself the office of an atoning Savior for sinners, the penalty of sin should be paid in his own person. When that penalty was paid, and all the demands of the moral law were met and discharged, and all the types and symbols of the ceremonial law were actualized, and all the prophecies of a suffering Savior were fulfilled, then, and only then, could and did the One Mediator between God and man, in his dying, and yet triumphant utterance, proclaim, "it is finished."

ARTICLE III.

EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA SYNOD.

By Professor F. A. Mahlenberg, of Pennsylvania College.

IN a previous number of the Review,* we gave a somewhat detailed narrative of the earlier efforts of our forefathers, to furnish the church with educational institutions. That account embraced the period of our history as a church in Pennsylvania, antecedent to the termination of our Revolutionary struggle, during which she had no collegiate institution of her own, but only a small share, for a limited time, in the instruction and management of the University of Pennsylvania.

We also promised, in the concluding part of that narrative, to trace out in this subsequent portion, the history of a collegiate institution, established especially for the benefit of our own church; and in this and other efforts in behalf of literary and theological education, to give greater prominence to *Synodical*, rather than individual action. That promise we proceed to fulfil, and for the purpose of presenting the two parts of the subject in the clearest light, and avoiding the injurious and unpleasant consequences, often arising to individuals and public bodies, by confounding things, in themselves distinct and separate, we will give, first, an account of the efforts of the Synod to secure for the church a *collegiate*, and then a *theological* institution.

Now some of these efforts were unsuccessful, while others were successful, though terminating, in the providence of God, in a way quite contrary to the design of the projectors. Of course, it is our intention to give greater prominence to those which were successful, but still, in connection with these, it is both necessary, and may be useful, to have brief narratives of the others. The successful collegiate effort was that with which the Synod began, *Franklin College*; and it is the history of the connection of this body, with the establishment and continued progress of this Institution, through a period of more than sixty years, which we propose to give in the body of the narrative. The further particulars with reference to the College, with which the Synod, as a body,

* Vol. X., p. 269.

had no connection, but which were the result of the action of its own Board of Trustees, as well as the account of *Frey's Institute*, in behalf of which the Synod was interested for nearly thirty years, will be given in foot-notes, as matters of interest to the church; whilst in the second part of the subject, *all* the efforts of the Synod to establish theological institutions, will be presented in the body of the article.

After the successful completion of our Revolutionary war, the German influence became more an object of attention. Many of them had, during the course of that struggle, freely shed their blood, and spent their substance in defence of our liberties, and as officers and private soldiers, endured the many privations of the war which terminated in the independence of the United States. Some of them had also been elected to fill important offices in the general and State governments, and as there was also a large body of German settlers in Pennsylvania, it became an object of importance, as it was an act of justice, to aid them in their efforts to benefit their people, and thus also to secure their friendship. They were therefore courted by prominent gentlemen of English descent in the State government. These gentlemen uniting their influence with that of our clergy and more intelligent laity, who were sincerely interested for the intellectual, moral and social welfare of their brethren, made application to the State Legislature, for a Charter or Act of Incorporation for a College, for the special education of the German population, and their descendants, of this State. This application was made during the session of 1786—7, under the title of an *Act to incorporate and endow the German College and Charity School in the Borough and County of Lancaster*.

As the design of this Institution is often spoken of, it may be well here to quote the preamble with the second section of the act, and to give, in a condensed form, the leading features of its Charter. These read as follows: "Whereas the citizens of this State of German birth or extraction, have eminently contributed, by their industry, economy and public virtues, to raise this State to its present happiness and prosperity, and whereas, a number of citizens of the above description, *in conjunction with others*, from a desire to increase and perpetuate the blessings derived to them from the possession of property and a free government, have applied to this House for a Charter of Incorporation and a donation of lands, for the purpose of establishing and endowing a College and Charity School in the Borough of Lancaster: And

whereas, the preservation of the principles of the *Christian religion*, and of our republican form of government, in their purity, depends, under God, in a great measure, on the establishment and support of suitable places of education, for the purpose of training up a succession of youth, who, by being enabled fully to understand the grounds of both, may be led the more zealously to practice the one, and the more strenuously to defend the other, therefore :

Be it enacted, and it is hereby enacted by the Representatives of the freemen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in General Assembly met, and by the authority of the same, that there shall be, and hereby is erected and established in the said Borough of Lancaster, in the County of Lancaster, in this State, a College and Charity School, for the instruction of youth in the *German, English, Latin, Greek and other learned languages, in Theology and in the useful Arts, Sciences and Literature.*"

It was designed, therefore, for the benefit of citizens of this Commonwealth, of German birth or extraction, and of others not thus descended, that they might be carefully instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, the English, German, and classical languages, science and literature, to qualify them for taking an intelligent and active part in the management of the affairs of this State, or of the general government, or of being useful to their fellow-citizens in the learned professions or the mechanic arts. In one word, its design was to make them Americans, not to keep them foreigners. They were to be *Americans* of German descent, and not *Germans* of American parentage.

Besides this, it was provided, that the number of its Trustees should consist of not less than *forty-five*, of whom fifteen were to be forever selected from the members of the Lutheran church, constantly in the same relative proportion between clergy and laity, fifteen from the Reformed or Calvinistic church, and the remaining fifteen from any other denomination of Christians, with the special provision that no one not an inhabitant of this State, should be capable of being elected one of the Trustees. The officers of the Institution were to be a Principal, Vice Principal and Professors, the Principal to be selected alternately from the Lutheran and Reformed churches. "One-sixth of the capital was to be appropriated to the maintenance and support of a Charity School for children of both sexes and all religious denominations, on the most liberal plan, consistent with the ability of said College."

Ten thousand acres, with the usual allowance, of the unappropriated lands of the State, were granted to the Trustees and their successors. It was also provided, that "from a profound respect for the talents, virtues and services to mankind in general, but more especially to this country, of his Excellency, Benjamin Franklin, Esq., President of the Supreme Executive Council, the said College shall be, and hereby is denominated Franklin College."*

Arrangements were made for organizing the College immediately. An address was prepared, by a committee of fifteen of the Trustees, whose names have already been given, written, if we mistake not, by Dr. Helmuth, published with a copy of the Charter in German, and circulated in pamphlet form among the Germans of this State. This address urged upon them the duty and importance of attending to the education of their children, and presented, as reasons, that they would thus be preserved from becoming the dupes of designing men, would be prepared to take part in the administra-

* The first Trustees were the following:

Hon. Thomas Mifflin,	Caspar Shaffner,
Hon. Thomas McKean,	Peter Hoofnagle, Esq.,
Rev. Dr. Helmuth,	Christopher Crawford,
" Caspar Weiberg,	Paul Zantzingen,
" Henry E. Muhlenberg,	Adam Hubley, Esq.,
" William Handel,	Adam Reigart,
" N. Kurtz,	Jasper Yeates, Esq.,
" G. Troidenier,	Stephen Chambers, Esq.,
" John Herbst,	Philip Wager,
" Jos. Hutchins,	William Sheaf,
" Frederick Weyland,	William Rawle, Esq.,
" A. Helfenstein,	Philip Greenwaldt,
" W. Ingold,	John Musser,
" J. Van Buskirk,	Hon. Robert Morris,
" Abraham Blumer,	Hon. W. Bingham,
" Frederick Dalecker,	Dr. Benjamin Rush,
" Christian E. Schultz,	Lewis Farmer, Esq.,
" John B. Cousie,	Michael Hahn,
" Rev. F. V. Meltzheimer,	George Clymer, Esq.,
Peter Muhlenberg, Esq.,	W. Hamilton,
Joseph Hubley, Esq.,	C. Kucher,
Joseph Hiester, Esq.,	D. Hiester, Esq.
George Stake, Sr.	

tion of the government, would become qualified to become pastors, teachers and professional men, as lawyers and physicians, and would even be aided by it in the mechanic arts. It was but too frequently said to their discredit: "yes, they are honest, worthy men, but they have no knowledge of the English language, they are not able to write, they are not acquainted with our laws, and are therefore incompetent to take an active participation in affairs as they ought, and, under other circumstances, would be qualified to do."

Nor was this all, the College was formally opened, *during the meeting of the Synod of Pennsylvania in Lancaster*, with appropriate ceremonies, in the month of June, 1787. The 6th of this month was the day appointed for the public services. The Institution was inaugurated with religious services and an appropriate address or sermon, by Dr. Henry E. Muhlenberg, who was elected its first Principal. These services took place in Trinity Church, Lancaster, in the presence of the Synod and a concourse of the people of Lancaster, Trustees, &c.

The sermon delivered on that occasion, and published by request of the Trustees, is now before the writer, and shows the correct views then entertained by the members of the Synod, on the subject of education. It is upon the words: *Ye fathers bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.*—Eph. 6: 4. After alluding to the object for which they were assembled, viz., to commence an institution for the education of their children, and stating that no more appropriate commencement could be made, than by earnest prayers for the blessing of Almighty God, the Giver of every good and perfect gift, and the presentation of proper arguments to encourage each other, to foster and rejoice in the success of all such means of improvement, he proposes as his theme, *the value of a good education.*

The discourse is divided into two parts; what is a good education, and what considerations show its value. A good education is defined to be one which is conducted in accordance with the example of God. The body and soul must both be educated, for this world and for eternity, and where the two interests come into collision, the body and time must give way to the soul and eternity. The attention must be directed to the study of nature, the Holy Scriptures, the voice of conscience, to experience, and to upright and consistent Christian examples. The value of such an education is evident, from the following considerations: that it is a di-

vine work, that it distinguishes man from the brutes, it benefits the teacher, it is a source of blessing to the individual and the land in which he lives, qualifies men for being useful and benefactors of others, as lawyers, physicians, pastors. We present a few extracts from this discourse.

"An education which is designed to be good, must be conducted on these principles. We must strive to enlighten the understanding of the pupil, and to affect the heart with suitable emotions. We must implant in it a love of virtue, and zeal for every good work. He who is only or chiefly concerned for the body, and suffers the soul to be unimproved, does not act as God. He who labors only to affect the understanding, without being concerned for the radical improvement of the heart, does not act as God does, 2 Tim. 3: 15. It is worth the labor of a whole life, to rear but one person in a Christian manner. We should, my brethren, erect schools, not only those of a lower grade, though these in greater numbers, but also those of a higher character. Public institutions have many advantages over private ones, intended only for a few pupils. The large number animates both teacher and pupil, lessens the expense, and extends most widely the best influences. More especially, Christians, professed followers of Jesus in these western solitudes, let me freely express to you the wishes of my heart, allow your children to study for the ministry, that they may at one time become useful instruments to extend the knowledge of the Lord in these regions. Are you not concerned for the affliction of Joseph? You see before you nearly all the pastors of German Christians in this land, so few among so many thousands! Help, ye men of Israel! that more laborers may be sent out into the great vineyard."

Efforts were also made to realize money, by donations and subscriptions for this object, on the part of gentlemen interested in its success, both in the city of Lancaster and elsewhere. Circulars were sent to those residing at a distance, and a committee of the Trustees was appointed, to collect funds in that vicinity. We wish it could be said that these means were crowned with great success. But such was not the case, the circulars and personal efforts of the committee of Trustees, resulted in a way calculated to depress them in a very great degree. Small sums, it is true, were obtained, but these were not sufficient in number to cover the expenses connected with such an attempt. No very large ones were received, the only two which seem to deserve special notice

at this time, were one of £200, Pennsylvania currency, by Dr. Benjamin Franklin, and another by William Hamilton, Esq., viz., four lots of ground, with a building thereon erected, which had been used in Revolutionary times as a storehouse. Notwithstanding these untoward circumstances, the organization of the College was completed, and in addition to the Principal, who gave his services gratuitously, three additional instructors were procured, Rev. Joseph Hutchins, Professor of the English Language and Belles Lettres; Rev. F. V. Melzheimer, Professor of German, Latin and Greek, with salaries, at first, of £200, Pennsylvania currency each; and Mr. W. Reichenbach,* Professor of Mathematics, at a salary of £50 per annum. How many students they had the first year, we are not able to say, it could not have been a great many, for the next year one of the teachers reported the presence of fourteen pupils.

With such want of success in their collections, and so few students, it can very easily be seen, the operations of the Institution could not be carried on upon an enlarged scale. The very next year the salary of one of the Professors was reduced, and by degrees the number of Professors, until, as a general remark, it might be said, there was but one teacher present, who labored in the Institution, with such a support as the limited funds of the College could give, and the local patronage afford. The school, it must be admitted, was constantly kept open, so that the parents resident in that vicinity seldom stood in need of a place where their children could receive, at least, a respectable classical education. Among some of those who served as teachers in this Institution, at a subsequent period of this early part of its career, may be mentioned Rev. Mr. Stewart, of Ireland, recommended by Dr. B. Rush, the now celebrated Rev. Dr. Brownlee, and others.

The report of the first Treasurer of the College, John Hubley, Esq., will show the discouraging state of the funds, even during the first year of its existence. He reports a deficit of £244, and thus writes to Dr. Benjamin Rush, of Philadelphia: "I wrote to you some time ago, how poorly our College stands, and how far we are in arrears; these arrears are increasing daily, and unless you gentlemen in Philadel-

* This gentleman subsequently willed his library to the Institution, which is now part of the property of "Franklin and Marshall College."

phia will put your shoulders to the wheels, we must inevitably perish, and that soon."

It is, however, not surprising, when we reflect carefully upon the circumstances of our church and country at that time, and up to the year 1817, that the hopes of our people were then disappointed. The time for success on so large a scale, had not yet come. The circumstances of our own people, at this time, were not found to be such as to insure the success of a College, as there were but few of German descent, who desired to give their sons a collegiate education, and it could scarcely have been expected that the gentlemen of English descent, residing in Philadelphia and elsewhere, would give largely for the support of it, or send their children there to be educated; and in addition to all this, the lands presented by the State were altogether unsaleable, and even if they could have been sold, would have yielded, at the market price, but an insignificant sum. Other resources than these they had not, and they did the best their circumstances allowed. The gentlemen, especially those of the Lutheran and English churches, and at a later period a few also of the Reformed communion, husbanded its resources, and thus prepared the way for greater good in the future. It was well that there were a few who thus gave at least some attention to it, for whilst its lands were lying unsold, little interest was manifested in its history at certain periods, so much so, that often it was impossible to obtain a quorum of Trustees to transact business, for three or four meetings in succession, and many of the earlier records were lost, or have only been preserved from destruction, by the care of more diligent and thoughtful successors. This apathy in the minds of many will be explained, when we remark, that even at as late a period as 1828, the funds in the Treasury were only about one thousand dollars.

But the want of funds, and the state of education among our own people, were not the only causes which interfered at that time to thwart the hopes of its more sanguine friends. The great prevalence of the German language, and the tenacity with which many of our forefathers clung to their mother tongue, was another, and a very potent element in bringing about a failure in their efforts to found an institution, whose ultimate aim would be to make the English predominant over the German. Had the Lutheran and Reformed population been thoroughly anglicized, and equal in intelligence and general culture with the English population around

them, the result might, and probably would have been different.

Besides this natural prejudice in favor of their own language, sufficiently strong already, which operated unfavorably to success, circumstances occurred about this time in some of our churches, which gave it increased and morbid action. A jealousy of the English language was excited in many of the members of the Pennsylvania Synod, which constantly increasing in intensity, by the force of circumstances, did much to prevent that harmony of operation, essential in any state of affairs to success in such an undertaking, but absolutely so, with the limited resources of our church at that time.

As long as it was not proposed to introduce the English language into our congregations, even those most ardently attached to the German, were willing to coöperate in behalf of an institution in which the English language was intended to be a subject of greater prominence than the German. But when the churches in which they ministered began to feel the pressure in favor of English preaching, the matter was viewed in a different aspect. The first agitation arose in the congregation in Philadelphia, where the parties were nearly equal; and as the matter was decided by a small majority against the introduction of the English language into the church, a separation took place, and a new organization was effected. The views and feelings which were prominent in the congregational conflict, were transferred to the Synod, and two parties were formed there.

What was the temper of a majority of the Synod, in consequence of this excited contest, may be seen from the resolutions which were passed in 1805, and appended as amendments to the standing regulations adopted for the government of that body: "the present Lutheran Ministerium *must* remain a German speaking body;" "Lutherans using the English language, *may* form a congregation of their own;" "their pastors will be acknowledged, if they undergo an examination, and *subject* themselves to its rules." And in 1807 it was also decided, by a vote of twenty-four to twenty-three, that no English communication, and nothing but German discussion should be allowed in the Synod, except by special permission.

It is true, this violence of feeling was modified considerably by the earnest opposition of the minority, and the increasing desire for English preaching, in spite of all synodical resolu-

tions to the contrary, so that in 1812, the subject was examined with much more moderation and wisdom, as far as the congregations were concerned. Difficulties had arisen in the congregation at Hagerstown, in consequence of the introduction of English preaching by the Rev. Solomon F. Schaeffer. A committee of five was appointed to settle the difficulty, upon equitable principles, Dr. Helmuth and Mr. Lange representing the German interest, Dr. Muhlenberg and Mr. Benjamin Schaum the English, and Dr. Lochman the Synod. They unanimously reported, as a general principle, for all cases of this kind, "that changes should be made only with the consent of the vestry, and a majority of the communicant and contributing members of the congregation to which they belong."

The same spirit, though somewhat subdued, still existed and manifested itself in the proceedings of the Synod, and was diffused throughout many of our congregations, to the great injury of the church, and we wish we could say it had spent its force even in our day. The action of the Synod, and the sentiments of some of the principal members of it, still in print, leave us no room to doubt the correctness of the above statement. They endeavored to infuse new zeal into the people of this State, in behalf of German schools and German teachers, and the "fatherland." A German magazine was established, containing strong appeals in favor of the above objects, to the Germans of Pennsylvania, urging them to greater activity for their language and their religion, and inviting them to found a German College. Now we cheerfully admit, that all these measures were, in themselves, good, and calculated to promote the temporal and spiritual welfare of those for whom they were intended, but the *extent* to which it was proposed to carry them, and the short-sighted policy, based upon these extravagant premises, we cannot but condemn and deplore. The appeals themselves are ably written, and contain a great deal to which we can give our unqualified assent, in respect to the virtues and services to mankind of the German nation. But there is also much that is exceptionable. There is that arrogant and self-satisfied laudation of the German people, which is, in its spirit, opposed to Christian humility and love, and in its assertions, in direct conflict with the truth. German literature and German character, are represented as the personification of excellence, the English the very opposite. The English language, in consequence of its poverty, is not capable of expressing

accurately the profound mysteries and the deep feeling of the Lutheran faith, and the study of it is calculated to prepare men only *for this world*. Therefore the German language was to be upheld, by laws as unalterable as "those of the Medes and Persians." It was to be made predominant in all the schools, the churches and the synods. This was the policy which these appeals were calculated to foster, in opposition to the providence of God, and the practice of Protestants, detrimental to the best interests of their children and the church, and so inconsistent with enlightened reason, that had Americans endeavored to act in this way in Germany, they would doubtless have been characterized as insane.

This was not, it is true, the policy of the early founders of our church in Pennsylvania, nor of all their immediate successors, and happily it did not prevail. Had this been the case, our church would have been merged in other denominations, except where it was fed by new accessions of foreign immigrants. Yet though it did not destroy our church, it interfered with our people in their educational efforts, and this cause, together with the war in which our country was engaged, and those previously mentioned, by their continued and united influence prevented our fathers from succeeding with their first College. Little is said of it, therefore, in the proceedings of Synod, between the years 1787 and 1817, and it seemed to be necessary, therefore, to assign suitable reasons for their failure, which we consider those already mentioned to have been.

The next Synodical action, in reference to this institution, took place during the years 1818—21. The immediate cause of renewed attention to this, on the part of the Pennsylvania Synod, was the German Reformed Synod. This body, at its meeting in York, in 1817, upon the motion of Mr. Samuel Helfenstein, had, "in consequence of the increase in the number and the growth of the congregations," appointed a committee to take into consideration the propriety of establishing a Collegiate Institution, for the preparation of ministers for their churches. This committee, in consequence of the great importance of the subject, had recommended the postponement of it until the following year, and also the appointment of another committee, to confer with the Lutheran Synod. This committee appeared at the session of the Pennsylvania Synod in Harrisburg, in 1818, and brought this matter before them. A committee, consisting of Revs. J. G. Schmucker, Jäger and H. A. Muhlenberg, was appointed to take the matter into consideration, who, after consultation,

reported: that "in answer to the enquiry what would be the best means of furnishing both churches with a Collegiate Institution for the education of ministers," they would inform the Synod of the existence of an institution in Lancaster, by the name of Franklin College, would express their regret that it had heretofore been so much neglected, and the design had failed, which the State had in view from the beginning; that they had examined the Charter and had found it necessary to propose, that the President be instructed to call together a general meeting of the Trustees. They also proposed finally, that the Lutheran and Reformed clergymen residing in Lancaster, should see that the above mentioned recommendation be attended to, and that a committee of both Synods should be appointed to prepare a joint plan, by which the above mentioned institution may be best fitted to accomplish the above object.

The report of the committee was adopted by the Synod in all its particulars, and Messrs. J. G. Schmücker, Lochman, Geissenhainer, Sen., Endress and H. A. Muhlenberg appointed to act for this Synod, in accordance with the last item of the above mentioned report.

At the subsequent meeting of the Synod, held in Baltimore, in the year 1819, Dr. Endress gave in a verbal report, in behalf of the committee appointed the preceding year, to confer with a similar committee of the German Reformed Synod, in reference to Franklin College, and the following action was had on this subject:

"Resolved, That one hundred dollars be given out of our Synodical Treasury, for the support of the College in Lancaster, in case the Reformed Synod determine to give an equal sum."

What was reported by Dr. Endress to the Synod, as the result of the action of the joint committee of the two churches, does not appear in the minutes of Synod, but having in our possession a copy of the minutes of the Board of Trustees of Franklin College, containing the memorial which was presented to them by Dr. Endress in behalf of the committee of conference, we are able to give the substance of their recommendations. This meeting of the Board of Trustees took place the 17th of November, 1818. The memorial contains *three* general recommendations; the studies, the teachers, and the supposed action of the Synods. In reference to the *first*, they thought the following branches should be taught therein:

"the German and English languages grammatically, Arithmetic, the Latin and Greek languages, the general outlines of Biblical and Modern Geography, of sacred and profane history, of Natural Philosophy and of Natural Theology." As to the *second*, they recommended that *three* teachers should, as soon as possible, be employed, one to give instruction in the English branches; "one in the German language (grammatically) the Latin language (according to the English mode of teaching Latin), in Biblical Geography, Sacred and Profane History;" "and another, in the Greek language (according to the English mode of teaching Greek) and in the first rudiments of Natural Philosophy and Natural Theology." As to the *third* point, they express to the Board of Trustees their conviction that if the College be placed on such a footing, the Synods together, would be willing, until the College had a fund of its own, to contribute pecuniary aid to the amount of about ten or twelve hundred dollars per annum. The above was the plan adopted by the joint committee of the two Synods, presented and acceded to by the Board of Trustees of Franklin College.

Yet it did not succeed, for at the meeting of the Synod in 1820, at Lancaster, we find that Dr. J. G. Schmucker reported to the body that the joint committee had adopted a plan, but that Dr. Endress and Mr. Hoffmeier, in whose hands it had been left for publication, had neglected to attend to this duty. Dr. Endress made a lengthy speech in his own behalf, but the Synod did not deem the reasons assigned, of such a nature as to exculpate him altogether.

The only additional item of interest in reference to this, is, that the College received from the two Synods, before the plan failed, the sum of two hundred dollars. *

At this meeting of the Synod also, the Rev. Mr. Schnee called the attention of the body to *Frey's Institute* at Middletown.*

* George Frey, a merchant of Middletown in 1806, left a valuable estate, consisting of nine hundred acres of choice land with improvements erected thereon, for the purpose of establishing and endowing an institution for the education of orphans, to be called "Emmaus Institute." Among a great many other particulars in his will, it was provided, that the superintendent and teacher of the above Institute should be members of the Lutheran church, and that the orphans who should be educated in it, should be trained strictly in accordance with the orthodox faith of the church, as laid down in the Augsburg Confession. As already stated, the attention of the Synod was directed to this subject in the year 1820, and it appears in different phases in the minutes of Synod, with but few

From 1822—30, the Institution is not noticed in the proceedings of the Synod; during these years, this body met in other places than Lancaster, which may partly account for the fact of its being, for the time, kept out of view, for when it was brought before the Synod, subsequently to this period, down to the year 1850, it was invariably during its meeting

interruptions, up to the year 1847, when the matter was finally brought to a close, adverse to the claims of the Synod, by a decision of the Supreme Court. Elaborate reports were presented on this subject, at different times, and for a period, the hope of ultimate success was very bright. Thus in 1835, Dr. S. S. Schmucker presented a lengthy report, in connection with which, he informed the Synod that the heirs were willing to compromise the matter in dispute, and would agree to give one-twentieth of the estate to the Directors of the Poor of Dauphin County, one-half of the remainder they would retain, and the other half surrender, to be equally divided between the two Lutheran Synods of Pennsylvania. In view of this prospective termination, he proposed that the Synod of Pennsylvania should intrust their portion to the Directors of the Seminary at Gettysburg, who would pay the lawful interest to the President of the Pennsylvania Synod, to be applied to the education of poor Lutheran orphans, and that the Synod should agree to compel all those who received aid out of this fund, and intended to prosecute their theological studies at a public institution, to go to Gettysburg for this purpose. Further, that the Directors should be allowed a per centage for those students not thus educated. In 1846 also, in consequence of petitions sent in from different parts of the State, and the exertions of legal and other gentlemen acting for the Synod, an act was passed by the Legislature, authorizing the appointment of two Trustees, one from each of the Synods, to act for the proper management of the estate, in accordance with the will of the testator. The Trustees acting under the will, however, refused to be governed by the provisions of this act, and the matter was brought up before the Dauphin County Court, where it was decided in favor of the Synods, and against the acting Trustees. The matter, however, was carried by appeal, to the Supreme Court, and the decision of the lower court was reversed. It was "*held*, that the Trustees elected under the provisions of the will, had vested rights, that they were divested of these rights, privileges and franchises, by the act of 1846, without a trial by due course and process of law; by reason of which, a solemn contract of the State was impaired, and therefore the act of April, 1846, was unconstitutional and void." This estate, according to the estimate of Chief Justice Gibson, in a decision rendered in 1834, upon the same subject, when brought before him in a different way, was worth one hundred thousand dollars, and he remarks in the same connection: "This case is an additional instance of the futility of private charities. Even when established by law, and provided with the conservative apparatus of visitation, inspection, and whatever else ingenuity could contrive, these misdirected efforts of benevolence have conducted but to the emoluments of the agents intrusted with their care. So will it ever be, where the vision of the visitor is not sharpened by individual interest." How much better for men to contribute liberally to benevolent objects during their lifetime, than they may both superintend and enjoy the application of their bounty. *Twenty-five years of Synodical action to no purpose!*

544 *Educational efforts of the Pennsylvania Synod.*

in Lancaster, and the impetus given to it on these occasions, lasted for several subsequent meetings, and then again its force was spent, to be renewed at a subsequent meeting, in the same place.

In 1830, at the meeting in Lancaster, a committee was appointed to examine the condition of Franklin College, who presented a report in the English language, but as it was considered by the Synod not sufficiently extended, the committee was granted a longer time to bring in a more complete one "on this important subject." This committee reported at a later period of the session, and brought before the Synod a statement of the condition of the funds of the College. This they were able at that time to do, for two years previously the Hon. Samuel Dale had been appointed agent to visit the lands owned by the Institution in the counties of Venango, Bradford and Tioga, and ascertain what was their true condition, and what was really the amount still owned by the Board. He had discharged the duties of his agency to the satisfaction of the Board, and his carefully prepared report had been recorded in the minutes of that body. The committee of the Synod had access to this report, for we find on comparison, that the items in each correspond. They gave a very reliable and interesting statement, therefore, on this subject, and showed that at length, the funds of the Institution, after having been long locked up in unsaleable lands, were now beginning to be available. They reported the resources of the Institution, at that time, as consisting of upwards of twelve thousand dollars securely invested, arising from lands already sold, and expressed the confident belief, that an equal sum would be realized from the lands still unsold. This opinion was based upon the price of land at that time, for it was subsequently found, in the final division of the accumulated fund in 1853, to amount to more than double the above estimated sum.

This committee also allude with pleasure to the fact, that they had heard of an effort in progress, on the part of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, to place the Institution on a more permanent basis for the good of the two churches, and the promotion of the welfare of the Germans of Pennsylvania. In consequence of the encouraging prospects presented in the report of the committee, the Synod passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the committee prepare an extended report upon this important subject, have it printed and circulated

among our congregations." The committee appointed for this object, were Revs. Baker, Baetis, Ulhorn, Filbert, Dr. F. A. Muhlenberg and Mr. Keffer.

An appeal was prepared by this committee, in reference to which the Synod, at its subsequent meeting, resolved, "that each member of their body should take home with him a number of copies, and have them distributed among the members of his congregation." The Reformed Synod were coöperating with the Synod of Pennsylvania at this time in this matter, and in view of this circumstance, the following additional resolution was passed at the same meeting :

"*Resolved*, That the committee appointed last year for the investigation of the affairs of Franklin College, at Lancaster, be continued this year, for the purpose of meeting a committee appointed by the Reformed Synod, at the specified time at Lancaster, to confer about this matter." These negotiations, however, between the two bodies representing the two great divisions of German Protestants in Pennsylvania, terminated again unsuccessfully, and the whole matter was allowed to slumber profoundly, as far as the Synod was concerned, until the year 1837, at its *next* meeting in Lancaster, when one of the Trustees resident there invited the renewed action of the Synod.

This Trustee lamented the small degree of interest and earnestness manifested by the Synod in this important matter, and his representations were successful, at least in getting several resolutions passed, though the matter did not become the subject of very earnest action. The Synod resolved to have a new committee appointed to enlighten the body once more on this subject the succeeding year, and to prepare a petition to the Legislature, urging it to adopt all suitable means to carry out the wishes of the Synod, in resuscitating this ancient Institution, and placing it on the footing intended by its early founders, and they also made it the duty of each pastor in their connection, to obtain signatures to these petitions, and to forward them to the seat of government. We cannot trace these resolves any further, for in the minutes of the succeeding years, they are not again referred to, they probably met with an untimely death at that session; they certainly, if even partially carried out, did not result favorably for the Institution. The authorities of the State did not interfere. As far also as the Synod is concerned, there was, very strangely, no mention made of the subject, until it met in Pottsville, in 1850, when the incipient

measures, looking towards the present educational arrangements at Gettysburg, had already been entered into in another quarter, which eventually secured their hearty coöperation and efficient support. These we propose now more particularly to examine. How their attention was called renewedly to this subject, at this particular time, will appear from what follows. A series of measures had been entered into by the Board of Trustees of Franklin College, (of which and the history of the Institution under the management of its own legally appointed officers, a more detailed statement is given below*), which, after protracted discussion, ended in a mutu-

* Of the management of this Institution by its own Board of Trustees antecedent to 1828, something has been already said, in the account given above, and all that it is necessary to say in addition, as to that period, is, that it was the aim of the Trustees to have one or more teachers constantly giving instruction under their superintendence, as their means and circumstances allowed. They could not, perhaps, have done more. But after that period, affairs assumed a brighter aspect. A general meeting was called, and a new election for officers was held, Rev. Dr. J. C. Baker having been elected President, which office he filled until the dissolution of the Institution, Samuel Dale Secretary, and J. Dorwart Treasurer. Judge Dale was also appointed agent at this meeting, to visit the College lands, and report in detail all the circumstances in reference to them, and it was this report, very satisfactory and complete in itself, handed in and ordered to be filed in March, 1829, which formed the basis of the report of the committee to the Synod, at its session in Lancaster in 1830, as mentioned above. From this time onwards, there was a great deal of interest awakened in the minds of the Board, in reference to the Institution, and its affairs were managed with great accuracy and fidelity, and the two churches represented in it, owe a debt of gratitude to those who thus faithfully managed its constantly increasing funds. In 1828, the Lancaster County Academy was opened for the first time, and this furnished an educational Institution for that locality, which was amply sufficient at the time, for all who chose to avail themselves of its privileges, and the classics and mathematics were taught in it for a number of years, by competent teachers, the first of whom was Mr. Jas. P. Wilson, who has since that time been President of Newark College, and subsequently Professor in the Union Theological Seminary at New York. In 1835 the Trustees of the College offered the use of its funds and buildings to the General Synod of the German Reformed church in session at Chambersburg, which offer was, however, declined. In 1840, the Lancaster County Academy edifice was purchased from its Trustees, by the Trustees of Franklin College, and after this purchase, an additional building was erected on the north side, to furnish increased accommodations for students. The school was opened under the new arrangement the same year, and F. A. Muhlenberg, Jr., and Jas. Regan were elected teachers. In 1841 an English department was added to the classical and mathematical, and Mr. G. Day elected teacher. This arrangement lasted four years, until April, 1845, when the last named gentleman resigned. In 1841 also, Dr. F. A. Muhlenberg was unanimously elected Treasurer, and Rev. Dr. Bowman, now Assistant Bishop

al agreement, on the part of all those interested in its funds, to this effect, that *one-third* part of the money belonging to Franklin College should be transferred to the Trustees of Pennsylvania College, to endow in it the "Franklin Profes-

of Pennsylvania, Secretary, which offices they held until the dissolution of the Franklin College Board.

After the resignation of Mr. Day, the two teachers previously mentioned, continued in the service of the Board until July 1st, 1846, when Mr. Jas. Regan resigned. At this period, F. A. Muhlenberg, Jr., was unanimously elected Professor of Languages, and Rev. J. Chapman Professor of Mathematics, and a union was effected with the public schools of the city of Lancaster, by virtue of which, those pupils of these schools who were sufficiently qualified, were permitted to pass through the two departments of Franklin College free of expense, in consideration of the payment of the salary of one of the teachers by the Board of School Directors, though the management of the Institution was in the hands of the Board of Trustees of Franklin College. This arrangement continued for three years, until September, 1849. In consequence of the organization of a *High School*, in connection with the Public Schools, in which an opportunity was afforded to parents of obtaining gratuitously for their children, a classical and mathematical education, the number of students in the College had very much decreased, and as most of the *local* patronage was thus withdrawn, it was thought by the two teachers, that a sufficient number of students could not be procured, unless they were obtained from abroad, and in order to secure this, it was, in their judgment, necessary to have increased accommodations in the way of buildings, for such students; and a proposal was presented by the writer, for the organization of the Institution on an enlarged scale, the first step towards which, was the erection of an edifice of sufficient size to lodge students. This project was presented to the Board in September, 1849, and after the matter was discussed, the following preamble and resolution were adopted:

"Whereas, in the opinion of this Board, it is absolutely necessary for the welfare of Franklin College, and for the more complete carrying out of the provisions of its Charter, to have a new and larger edifice erected for the accommodation of students from abroad, therefore,

Resolved, That five thousand dollars out of the Treasury, and such sum as may arise from the sale of the lot and buildings on Orange and Lime streets, be appropriated to effect the same, provided, that not less than ten thousand dollars be raised by subscription for the same purpose." The two teachers immediately, during the intervals when not occupied with their duties of instruction, engaged in the work of obtaining by subscription, the above mentioned ten thousand dollars, and they had secured subscriptions to the amount of about seven thousand dollars, when their further efforts were suspended by a proposal from the Trustees of Marshall College, which totally changed the whole aspect of the question. This brings us to the most interesting point in the history of Franklin College, for it was the first step in that series of measures, which resulted in the present permanent arrangement, referred to in the body of the narrative. The meeting at which these incipient steps were taken, was held during parts of three days, beginning with December 3d, 1849, and was largely attended, there having been twenty-six Trustees present.

sorship;" the remaining *two-thirds* be retained at Lancaster, and given to the Trustees of Marshall College at Mercersburg, on condition of its removal to Lancaster, and its carrying on its collegiate operations there under the name of

The discussions were of a very animated character, and the issues varied, and often quite unexpected. The first session was opened with a proposed resolution, offered by the Rev. Mr. Bucher, supposed to be the representative of Marshall College, and a zealous member of the German Reformed church, to divide *equally*, the funds of Franklin College, between Marshall and Pennsylvania Colleges. This, however, met with such determined resistance from all the Lutheran; most of the third party, and some of the German Reformed Trustees, that it was *withdrawn* by the mover. He next proposed to merge *Marshall College* in Franklin, and to remove the former to Lancaster, to which an amendment was offered by Mr. Longenecker, to extend the offer to *all* Christian denominations, and make an agreement with the one holding out the best terms. The next day two additional amendments were offered, one by Dr. F. A. Muhlenberg, proposing to unite Marshall and Pennsylvania College with Franklin, for the purpose of forming a strong Institution for the Germans and their descendants, and that the Board should pledge itself to select one-third of the Faculty from the Lutherans, one-third from the Reformed, and one-third from other Christian denominations; the Principal and Vice Principal to be selected in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of Franklin College: the other by Mr. Bucher, to give two-thirds of the fund to Marshall College, provided it be removed to Lancaster, the remaining one-third to Pennsylvania College, to endow a Lutheran Professorship. After a motion to postpone to the next annual meeting had been lost, and before the above amendments were acted on, it was moved and seconded to appoint a committee of *three* Lutherans and *three* Reformed, to consider the whole subject, and report a plan of adjustment at a meeting to be held the next day. The committee on the part of the Lutherans, consisted of Dr. F. A. Muhlenberg, C. Hager and J. F. Long; the Reformed, Revs. Messrs. Bucher, Mesick and Mr. Heitshu. This committee reported, through their chairman, Dr. Muhlenberg, the following plan of union, the succeeding day, December 5, viz: application should be made to the next Legislature for a change of Charters, authorizing the consolidation of the two Institutions. *One-third* of the Trustees were to be Lutherans, the other *two-thirds* Reformed, or such as they should see proper to elect; *two* Professors to be nominated by the Lutherans and elected by the Board, with salaries equal to those of the other Professors; and action to be delayed for sixty days, to allow time to confer with the several Faculties and the absent Trustees. This plan was *unanimously* agreed to by the twenty-two members of the Board who were present, and a committee appointed to correspond with the Trustees of Marshall College, of whom Dr. Bowman was chairman. The Treasurer was also authorized to furnish the Trustees of Marshall College with a statement of the financial condition of Franklin College, and ask the same of them.

A special meeting of the Board was held on the 16th and 17th of January, to consider the reply of the Board of Trustees of Marshall College. There were thirty-three members present, the largest number at any one time; among the Lutherans from abroad were Drs. Demme and S. S. Schmucker, and Rev. B. Keller. Among the important amend-

"Franklin and Marshall College;" and this was subsequently also confirmed by legislative action. The Act of the Legislature confirming and legalizing the action of the Board of Trustees, was approved by the Governor the 19th of April,

ments proposed to the plan of union, though none such were originally contemplated, were the following: *two-thirds* of the Trustees to be Reformed, *one-sixth* Lutherans, and *one-sixth* of other Christian societies; *one* Professor of the Lutheran church, salary to rate with those of the other Professors, a *second* might be chosen, provided a fund were raised by said church for his support.

The Treasurer also of their Board, reported the available funds of the Theological Seminary to be \$74,798.71, and of the College \$60,000.

The above amendments were then acted upon; the first, in reference to the Trustees, was decided in the *negative*, by a vote of eleven to twenty-one; the eleven being all Reformed except *two*, one of whom was Dr. Bowman. The second, in reference to the Professors, was also *negatived*, without a division. At this stage of the proceedings also a committee of conference on the part of Marshall College, was introduced by a special resolution, and pending the consideration of one of the other proposed amendments to the original plan of union, a resolution was offered, *to adhere to the terms of union agreed upon at the annual meeting in December, 1849*, which was adopted by a vote of twenty-one yeas to seven nays, all *Lutherans*. Here the Lutheran Trustees separated, some being favorable to a union with the Reformed on equitable principles, others being altogether opposed to it.

A committee of conference was now appointed, to consult with the representatives of the Board of Marshall College. This committee, on the part of the Board, was composed of two Lutherans, Dr. Muhlenberg and Mr. C. Hager, and three other gentlemen of the third party. They were, however, unable to agree with the Marshall College committee, and so reported the next day, and then these gentlemen submitted their propositions to the Board. They proposed, among other amendments, these, in reference to the Trustees and Professors: that the number of the former should be forty-five, "and a majority of the whole be a quorum to do business, and two-thirds of said quorum be German Reformed; and that the election of one of the Lutheran Professors provided for, shall be postponed until \$12000 be raised by subscription, and funded as a means of compensation for his services." These and other amendments were adopted, by securing the votes of the third party, who were anxious to have a College at Lancaster; but they did not meet with favor from the Lutherans. These latter, after the meeting was over, determined to *withdraw altogether* from the united institution, and a paper was prepared by Dr. S. S. Schmucker, after advising with the other Lutheran Trustees, and changing it to meet their views, which, after having been signed by a number of the Trustees as individuals, was intended to be the basis of future action, after the German Reformed Synod should have met. This body met, and in consequence of the new phase of the subject presented by the above action on the part of the Lutherans, refused to ratify the action of the Franklin Board. A final meeting was therefore held, the 12th of February, at which all the necessary arrangements were made, in accordance with the principles contained in the

550 *Educational efforts of the Pennsylvania Synod.*

1850. Now as the Lutheran Trustees in the Board of Franklin College were principally composed of clergymen and laymen residing east of the Susquehanna, and therefore represented that portion of the church, it was a desirable matter to have the sanction of its Synod, for what they had thus done, both with reference to retiring from the old Board, and consenting to a union with Pennsylvania College, an Institution within the territory of the West Pennsylvania Synod, and incorporated in 1832. It was also thought desirable to make use of the same occasion, for the purpose of inviting them to the consideration of the propriety of endeavoring to

paper above referred to, which terminated in the *entire separation* of the Lutheran interest from Franklin College, and the merging of it with its Trustees in Pennsylvania College. The provisions of this paper, as far as Pennsylvania College was concerned, were subsequently incorporated in the Charter of the consolidated Institution, which may be found in Section 12, in these words: "that three members of the Board of Franklin College be appointed to value and appraise the real and personal estate of said Franklin College, one by the Lutheran, one by the German Reformed, and one by the Remaining Trustees of said College, and that one-third of the value of said funds and property so ascertained, be retained by its Board of Trustees, until the German Reformed church pay an equal amount into its treasury, or give such legal obligations for its payment as may be deemed satisfactory, and so soon as said sum shall be so paid, it shall be paid over to the Lutheran members of said Franklin College Board, who, on the receipt thereof, or any portion of it, shall again pay the same to the Board of Trustees of Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, to be permanently invested by the Board last mentioned, for the support of a separate Professorship in said Institution, to be styled '*the Franklin Professorship*,' of which the first incumbent shall be Professor of ancient languages, and be elected by the existing Lutheran members of the Franklin College Board, and the right of nominating the subsequent incumbents shall be vested in the old Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Pennsylvania, and the interest only of said fund to be used at any time for the support of the incumbent of the said Professorship."

The committee appointed to prepare the plan of union on this last occasion, and to procure the passage of the Charter, were Messrs. Schmucker, Muhlenberg, J. F. Long, Bucher, Mesick, Breneman, Reynolds, Atlee and Humes, in both cases, with the substitution on the latter occasion, of C. Hager for J. F. Long, and D. Longenecker for P. Breneman.

This Charter was read before the Board of Trustees, and approved June 3d, 1850, the committee of three were appointed in Sept. 1851, to act as appraisers, viz., J. F. Long, D. Longenecker and McClure, and at the meeting in December, 1852, they reported the value of the property, and the Treasurer was authorized to pay over to the Lutheran portion of the Trustees of Franklin College, "\$17169.61, being the *one-third* part of the appraised value of the property of said College," which was then paid over to the Treasurer of Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, by the authority of its Board of Trustees. The last meeting of the Board of Franklin College, appears to have taken place July 27, 1853. We here

establish another Professorship in the same Institution. The writer of this article, therefore, prepared a memorial to the Synod, embracing two particulars, one a request of the Trustees, for an expression of opinion from that body, in reference to their action; another, an offer of the same persons, in conjunction with a respectable number of Lutherans residing in Lancaster, to raise two thousand dollars towards the endowment of a *second* Professorship in Pennsylvania College, if they were willing to undertake it. The signatures of the Trustees belonging to churches in connection with the Pennsylvania Synod, as well as of those gentlemen who were willing to aid in raising the sum of two thousand dollars for the above mentioned object, were appended to the memorial, having been obtained by the writer of it. This is the memorial which was the subject of synodical action at Pottsville, in 1850, as already stated, and these, the occasion and mode of calling the attention of the Synod again to the subject which had been before them so frequently, but for a number of years had apparently been forgotten or neglected. The proceedings in reference to it are found on the *twentieth* page of the German, and the *nineteenth* of the English printed minutes for that year.

In reply to the first point, the following resolution was proposed by the committee, and adopted by the Synod:

"Resolved, That the Synod heartily approve of the agreement entered into between the Lutheran and German Reformed Trustees of Franklin College, and indulge the confident hope that, under the divine blessing, it will promote the

add, for future use, the names of its principal officers, as far as the writer could ascertain them:

<i>Presidents.</i>	<i>Treasurers.</i>	<i>Secretaries.</i>
Dr. H. E. Muhlenberg,	John Hubley, Esq.,	Dr. Chr. Endress,
Dr. Chr. Endress,	Dr. Chr. Endress,	Hon. S. Dale,
Adam Reigart,*	Jonas Dorwart,	Dr. S. Bowman,
Dr. J. C. Baker.	W. Heitshu,	
	D. Longenecker,	
	Dr. F. A. Muhlenberg.	

Dr. Endress was, indeed, at one and the same time, President, Treasurer and Secretary; and the Lutherans have, in general, as appears from the minutes which are still preserved, had always the greatest share in the management, if they did not obtain the "lion's share" in the division of the funds.

* Only for a short time.

welfare of the church." They thought it premature to take any definite action at that time, in reference to the second particular of the memorial, as the arrangements had not yet been fully consummated by the success of the German Reformed in obtaining the necessary funds; but they advised the brethren of the Synod to direct the attention of their congregations to this subject, in order that they might be prepared to act when called upon. The two prominent members of this committee were, Revs. E. Peixoto and C. F. Welden, and their suggestion was also adopted by the Synod, "*heartily and unanimously*;" though they make the memorial speak of *two* Professorships, instead of one. In the interval between this meeting and the succeeding one, held at Allentown, one of the teachers in Franklin College, the writer of this article, had removed to Gettysburg, in November, 1850; the other had resigned in September, 1850, and the German Reformed agent had made such progress in his work, that the probability of the ultimate completion of the arrangement entered into between the two contracting parties, was very much strengthened, and by the advice of Dr. F. A. Muhlenberg, of Lancaster, the *renewal* of the above proposal, in a somewhat modified, but more specific form, through the Board of Trustees of Pennsylvania College, was made the subject of thought and action. In consequence of these representations, Dr. Baugher brought up the matter, at the meeting of the Trustees of Pennsylvania College, in April, 1851, and the following action was had:

"*Resolved*, That inasmuch as the President of the College expects to attend the next meeting of the Pennsylvania Synod, he have discretionary power to make the following propositions to said body, on behalf of this Board:

1. That they be requested to endow a *Professorship of German Literature and Belles Lettres in Pennsylvania College*.

2. That the Synod shall have the nomination forever of the incumbent of that Professorship."

In tracing this matter, thus originating, still further in the order of time, we find Dr. Baugher present at the meeting of the Synod, and the following report of his success in the printed minutes of that year.* It is first stated that Dr.

* Page fifteen of the English minutes; the writer has no German copy of the minutes of that year in his possession, and therefore cannot give the page in them.

Baughner, President of Pennsylvania College, was permitted to make some remarks in reference to a German Professorship in that Institution, and it was, thereupon,

Resolved, That the proposition of the Trustees of Pennsylvania College be submitted to a committee.* In committee, the above proposition of the Trustees of Pennsylvania College was modified, so as to read a "Professorship of the German Language and Literature." In this shape the matter was then brought before the Synod, and after discussion, the following resolution of the committee "unanimously adopted:"

"Resolved, That this Synod accept the proposition of the Trustees of Pennsylvania College." Another resolution, in the form of a request, was also appended, through the earnest solicitations of Dr. Krauth, by the authority of the Directors of the Seminary, which properly belongs to the *second* part of our narrative, and will therefore be reserved for that portion.

The intelligence of this synodical action, gave great pleasure to the Trustees of Pennsylvania College, and at their next meeting, September 18, 1851, they passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Secretary express to the 'Synod of Pennsylvania and adjacent States,' the gratification which this Board feels in the resolutions passed at their last meeting at Allentown, establishing a German Professorship in Pennsylvania College, on the terms proposed by this Board, and that they are prepared to coöperate in any proper measure for the consummation of this work."

The same committee of the Synod, who reported favorably as above stated, upon the subject of the endowment of the College Professorship, with the exception of Dr. Demme, were appointed to carry out the resolution, that is, make the necessary arrangements for collecting the money to endow it. They were fortunate, aided by several members of the Faculties of the College and Seminary at Gettysburg, in securing the services of the Rev. B. Keller, as agent, who commenced his labors on the 1st of November, 1851, and brought them to a successful close, after three years' service, having collected, up to that time, exclusive of all expenses, upwards of fifteen thousand dollars, all by his own exertions, with the

* Committee consisted of Rev. Dr. Baker, Rev. Dr. Demme, Rev. C. A. Hay, Rev. C. F. Welden, Rev. Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, H. H. Muhlenberg, M. D., and J. Ehler.

554 *Educational efforts of the Pennsylvania Synod.*

exception of eighteen hundred dollars, which had already been subscribed through the agency of another, in advance of his appointment, as may be seen in his final report, published by the committee, by synodical authority, at the conclusion of his labors. The Synod passed a vote of thanks to this aged but indefatigable and successful agent, upon the completion of his three years' toil, at their meeting in Reading in 1854; and the committee appointed, to use their own language, "*for funding a German Professorship in Pennsylvania College,*" published a full account of his labors, and reported the balance in the Treasurer's hands, at that time, to be \$15,463.28. It now amounts to upwards of sixteen thousand dollars, but the sum is *still* in the custody of the Synod, which we regret; for the Professorship cannot be regarded as *endowed* in the Institution, until the equivalent for the right of perpetually nominating the incumbent, which this body is to enjoy, has been paid over to the Trustees of Pennsylvania College, by whom it was secured to them; and the delay in this matter operates to the injury of the Synod and the church.

There yet remains the *election* of a Professor to fill the post thus created. An effort had been made already in 1853, to elect a Professor, but it was postponed, in consequence of the still incomplete state of the collections. But at the meeting in Reading in 1854, all the difficulties had been removed, and the Rev. W. J. Mann was selected with great unanimity for the position, which, to the regret of the church, he felt it his duty to decline.

At the next meeting, at Harrisburg, a second election was held. The Synod, acting in accordance with the suggestion of Dr. Krauth, offered, through the President, humble and united prayer to the Great Head of the church, for the guidance of his Holy Spirit in this important matter, and then proceeded to the election. Two candidates were placed in nomination, the election was conducted by ballot, and on counting the votes, it appeared, that with the exception of a very few, all had been cast for Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, and he was, therefore, declared, *viva voce*, to be the unanimous choice of the Synod. Notwithstanding the extraordinary character of this selection, the Dr. manifested great unwillingness to accept of the nomination, and he was accordingly allowed four weeks' time to decide as to the acceptance of the position thus unanimously tendered to him. In this interval, he consulted with the officers and members of the congregation at Easton, and also

visited Gettysburg to advise with the Faculties of the Institutions there, as to the arrangement of his duties. Difficulties in his way, though not connected with the College, induced him to decline accepting the position, and a special meeting of the Synod was held, in consequence, at Reading, in August of the same year, when arrangements were made to obviate these, and his resignation was not accepted. These satisfied the Dr., and he accordingly removed to Gettysburg in the spring of 1856, and has been, since that time, laboring assiduously and faithfully as "Professor of the German Language and Literature in Pennsylvania College."

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

The mode of preparing candidates for the ministry, in the period of our church's history in this State, prior to our Revolutionary war, has already been described.* The same system was kept up, with slight modifications, for some years immediately succeeding that period. The candidates pursued their preparatory studies wherever it was convenient, either at some of the colleges, as the University of Pennsylvania, or Dickinson; in the Schools or Academies in the neighborhood of their residence; or in the families of some of the ministers, and then studied theology under one of the pastors. Drs. Helmuth, Schmidt, Lochman, H. E. Muhlenberg, J. G. Schmucker, and others, prepared many students in this way, and this method has been more or less popular and continued even to the present time. It is true, some of the above ministers aimed at something more than mere private tuition, and established what they called Divinity Schools or Seminaries, as, for instance, Drs. Helmuth and Schmidt, in 1785, and Dr. Lochman, in 1802, but after all, they were more private than public institutions.

The earliest synodical action of a more formal character, upon this subject, during this second period, was a plan proposed and adopted at Easton in 1804. The most important features of it were the following:

"1. Each pastor was to seek out in his congregation young men of *capacity and piety*, and encourage them to study for the ministry.

2. As it was necessary for them to have a preparatory education, teachers were to be nominated in one or more suitable places, to instruct such young men in the following stu-

* Evangelical Review, Vol. X. p. 269 sq.

dies : Grammar, History, Geography, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Composition, Rhetoric and the elements of Astronomy.

3. After the completion of this course of studies, they were to be examined in one of the district conferences, and if the examination was satisfactory, a diploma was to be given them.

4. They were then to be required to select some ordained clergyman, under whom to prepare for the ministerial office."

The Synod also established a separate treasury, to be supplied by free-will offerings from the congregations, for the support of indigent students.

We have been able to find nothing further on this subject, in the documents we have examined, before the meeting of Synod at Germantown, in 1822, when the action of the *General Synod*, in reference to a Theological Seminary, was made a matter of deliberation. The Synod of Pennsylvania at its preceding meeting, had decided, by a vote of sixty-seven to six, in favor of the formation of this body, and its action now came up for consideration. They had decided adversely to the establishment of a Theological Seminary at that time, but proposed certain provisional arrangements for organizing such an institution in the course of a few years, such as the gradual collection of books for a library, the nomination of temporary instructors, the qualifications of candidates, &c. The Synod of Pennsylvania heartily approved of the action of the General Synod on several of the above particulars, the *necessity* for such an institution, the propriety of delaying the establishment of it for a few years, and the qualifications of candidates for the ministry in these words: "*that no young man should be received by any Synod as a student of theology, before he had obtained a diploma or certificate from some educational institute, in which the usual preparatory studies are taught, or has been examined and found qualified in such studies, by a committee of clergymen, appointed for this purpose.*"

The other items were postponed until the succeeding year, when, in consequence of strong remonstrances from many of the congregations, not from any change of sentiment in the members, but under protest, they declined, by a decisive vote of seventy-two to nine, taking at that period any further action on the subject of a Theological Seminary, but thus expressed their feelings. "We desired that the ministry of reconciliation should be honored among us, that it might continue to be efficient among our descendants, and looked for-

ward with hope to the time when a plan would be adopted to furnish young men with all those aids in their preparation for it, which the wise and gracious providence of God offers for our acceptance. We called such an institution a *Theological Seminary*, a nursery of divine knowledge." "And our own brethren misinterpret our conduct! They give ear to false and hostile representations, and suspect that love, which has heretofore sustained no sensible wound."

In consequence of this state of things in many parts of the church, "from a desire to promote the peace, harmony and love of the whole body, as well as of each separate congregation," they determined to wait until the congregations themselves would request the rescinding of the above resolution, which was connected also with a similar one upon the subject of the General Synod, and a union with the Reformed church.

After this retrograde course, the old order of things which prevailed before this time, was inaugurated afresh, viz., preparation for the ministry under individual pastors. The General Synod, it may be mentioned here incidentally, in accordance with their original intention, subsequently established a Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, in 1826.

As one of the necessary results of the above action, no mention is made of a Theological Seminary, as such, until the year 1842, when the subject in this specific form, was brought up in connection with the Theological Seminary at Columbus, Ohio, and in the following way.

At the session in Lancaster, a letter was received from pastor Wagenhals, written in the name of the Directors of the above Institution, in which he recommends it to the favorable notice of the Synod. The letter was read before the body, and the agent, Rev. W. Lehman, was authorized to make some remarks and statements in reference to it, and afterwards Dr. Demme offered the following resolution, which was adopted:

"Resolved, That this Synod regards the Theological Seminary of the German Evangelical Lutheran Church of Ohio, as an Institution deserving of our sympathy and support, and herewith recommend it to all the churches in our connection, and wish the Rev. W. Lehman a friendly reception in them."

At the same meeting, a committee was appointed to correspond with the Directors of it, for the purpose of ascertain-

ing more accurately how, and to what extent, the Synod of Pennsylvania could obtain a closer connection with that Institution. This committee reported at the subsequent meeting in Philadelphia, in 1843, that the General Synod of Ohio was willing to give to Pennsylvania Synod the election of *one-third* of the Directors, and in consequence of this information, "they thankfully accepted of the proposal, and pledged themselves to promote, to the extent of their ability, the welfare of the Institution." Four Directors, two clergymen and two laymen, were consequently elected at this, and four others at the subsequent meeting of the Synod in Pottsville, in 1844, and these latter were furnished with special instructions, among which we deem the two following to be worthy of particular attention, as indicating doubts already of the propriety of their action, in reference to this Institution: "*to make a proposal for the removal of the Seminary to a more desirable place; and to endeavor to give more permanence, and a greater extent to its educational arrangements.*"

The connection, however, proved to be a "rope of sand;" for the Rev. S. A. Mealy, in conjunction with his colleague, Rev. J. Haesbert, two of the clerical Directors elected by the Synod of Pennsylvania, attended the meeting of the Ohio Synod at Zanesville, in 1844, and the former presented a written report of their visit to the Synod, at Reading, in 1845, not of the most favorable character. He remarks:—"that he was fraternally and cordially invited to participate in the deliberations of the Ohio Synod, but he discovered with mortification and pain, that he was disqualified from acting as Director of the Seminary, to any extent, by a provision in its Charter, for the removal of which no arrangements had been made." In consequence of these representations, the Synod passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the obligations we assumed with regard to Columbus Seminary, are herewith cancelled, in consequence of the non-fulfilment of the agreement, on the part of the Joint Synod of Ohio."

The Synod were now compelled to look for relief nearer home, and as, for reasons which need not here be entered into, they had not full confidence in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod at Gettysburg, they endeavored to originate one within their own territory. Dr. Jacob Miller, President of the Synod, at its meeting in Orwigsburg, in 1846, spoke with great force upon the increasing necessity

for the establishment of some institution for the preparation of young men for the ministerial office. Subsequently also, he presented the following resolution: "that our Synod, for the present, appoint some qualified minister of our number, to educate young men for the ministry." Such a great degree of unanimity was afterwards found to exist among clergymen and laymen, on this important subject, that not only was the above resolution adopted, but further preparatory steps were taken to secure the above end. A committee, consisting of Drs. J. Miller and J. C. Baker, Rev. G. A. Reichart and Messrs. Dr. F. W. Heckel and Geo. Miller, were appointed to ascertain from Dr. Demme, whether he would be willing to become Theological Professor for Pennsylvania Synod, and if he should give his consent, to make the necessary arrangements with him. They were also authorized, in case he declined, to obtain some other suitable person.

The above committee held a meeting, for the accomplishment of the object for which they were appointed, in Philadelphia, September 23, 1846, and Dr. Demme signified to them his willingness to serve the Synod in the desired capacity, provided he could make the necessary arrangements with his church council; and in consequence of this, they had adopted a plan of operations. This plan embraced a number of particulars, the most important of which were, the salary of the Professor, the *necessity of a collegiate or other sufficiently extended preparatory education on the part of applicants*, the duties of pastors in reference to the procuring of suitable candidates, and the securing of contributions for the immediate and future wants of the Institution. All these met with the hearty approval of the Synod, and they determined that the Institution should go into operation the 1st of October, 1847.

Dr. Demme, however, at this meeting of the Synod, to the great regret of those in, and many out of the Synod, withdrew the consent he had previously given to the committee, "for reasons satisfactory to himself," and though they were continued to the following year, they reported, through their chairman, Dr. J. Miller, at the meeting in Easton, in 1848, that they had not been successful in securing the services of another suitable person to fill the station. Their action ended here, in this direction; now they begin to look towards Gettysburg.

Dr. S. S. Schmucker was present at this meeting of the Synod, and was allowed to participate in the deliberations on

this subject. He therefore took advantage of the occasion to invite their attention to the Seminary already established at Gettysburg, and "assured the Synod of the willingness of the Directors of that Institution, to adopt every possible means, in order to secure the friendly coöperation of their body." In consequence of these representations, the committee on the Theological Institution was continued, and directed to confer with the Board of Directors of the Seminary at Gettysburg, and ascertain on what terms the Synod of Pennsylvania could coöperate with them. The report of this committee is given in the printed minutes for 1849, during which year the Synod met in Lebanon. Dr. Baker, in behalf of the committee, addressed a number of questions to Dr. Morris, President of the Board of Directors, to which satisfactory answers were returned; and besides, the whole committee had a personal interview with the Dr. above mentioned and Revs. B. Keller and F. W. Conrad, who had been appointed to confer with the Synod of Pennsylvania upon this subject, and to offer to them the right of nominating a Professor, on certain conditions. They therefore felt themselves authorized to offer the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That this Synod accepts of the offer of the Directors of the Seminary at Gettysburg, and will yearly contribute from three to four hundred dollars for the support of a German Professor, provided such a one be appointed as is satisfactory to us, and as long as he continues there."

Another committee, subsequently appointed for this purpose, nominated Dr. Demme to the Directors of the Seminary, which nomination was afterwards unanimously confirmed by them, but the Dr. felt it his duty to decline accepting the position, for which every one "regarded him so eminently qualified."

This same subject was again before the Synod, at its meeting in Pottsville, in 1850, and in reply to an invitation of the Directors of the Seminary, to make a *second* nomination, through a committee appointed for this specific object, they proposed the following: That as they knew of no competent person to fill the position, they proposed to send a member of their body, Dr. Demme, to Germany, accompanied by one of the Directors of the Seminary, to be sent by them, who, with the assistance of experienced and judicious representatives of our church in that country, should select a suitable man for the station. The Directors, however, were unwilling to accede to this proposal, and in consequence of the neglect

of a committee, appointed to acquaint the Synod with their action, in attending to this duty, a coolness was occasioned between the parties concerned in these negotiations. Dr. Krauth, at the meeting in Allentown in 1851, in accordance with the above facts, begged the Synod not to blame the Directors with a want of courtesy, or a disinclination to coöperate with them; for the resolutions passed by them, strongly express the hope and the desire that the friendly feelings now existing between them may continue, and that they may still be able to labor harmoniously with each other.

Though the Synod thus failed in getting a German Professor in the Seminary, they were successful at this very meeting, in originating a measure, which ultimately led to the securing of the privilege of having one of their number to give theological instruction in the Seminary at Gettysburg. This seems, therefore, to be the proper place to allude to the *second* resolution, which, through the earnest representations of Dr. Krauth, was passed in connection with the determination to endow a "Professorship of the German Language and Literature in Pennsylvania College." The resolution is in these words:

"Resolved, That we request the Directors of the Seminary to acknowledge the German Professor as a member of the Seminary Faculty, and grant him the right of imparting theological instruction in the German language in that Institution."***

This action took place at Allentown in 1851, and the only other facts which may be of interest in this connection, are those which were the result of synodical agency at Harrisburg in 1855, and at the special session at Reading, of the same year. The Professor was obligated "to devote *half of his time* to imparting theological instruction in the German language in the Seminary," by a resolution offered at the meeting of Synod held at the former place; and the following additional items are extracted, for convenient reference, from the resolves passed in reference to the Seminary, at the special meeting in Reading,† which were subsequently also acceded to by the Directors of that Institution:

"1. Resolved, That the German Professor is obligated to devote *half* his time to instruction in the Seminary, and in

** Page 16, English Minutes for 1851.*

† English Minutes for 1855, p. 49.

all other respects to conform closely to the regulations laid down in the resolutions passed at Harrisburg.

2. *Resolved*, That the theological students, who need instruction in the German grammar, receive the same in the College, and that the German Professor impart no instruction in the German grammar in the Seminary.

3. *Resolved*, That after consultation with his colleagues, the German Professor adapt his instructions, in the various departments of Theology, scrupulously to the necessities of the students who may attend upon his German instructions in the Seminary.

4. *Resolved*, That said Professor at no time lecture upon the same theological subject, upon which, at that time, one of his colleagues is engaged in delivering lectures.

5. *Resolved*, That said Professor consult upon this point, with his colleagues, at the beginning of the session, immediately after the examination of the students."

What has been done in the Seminary, since the spring of 1856, when Dr. C. F. Schaeffer entered upon the discharge of his duties in that Institution, in accordance with the preceding arrangement, is not connected with our present undertaking; we have reached that point in our narrative, with which it was our intention to conclude.

It will be evident, from a perusal of the preceding narrative, that the Synod of Pennsylvania has been, with striking consistency, from its first organization, through all the varied phases of action in which it has been presented, for a period of more than a hundred years, the steadfast friend of an *educated and pious ministry*; and though, in some instances, it was obliged, by the force of circumstances, to depart in practice from its principles, in which too, it doubtless acted wisely, for there is no rule which does not admit of exceptions, the foregoing history of its proceedings still presents us with a picture, pleasant to look upon, safe to imitate, and worthy of high commendation.

But it also suggests another thought, of equal or greater importance. If we believe, as we do, in the language of the gifted poet, that

"There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them as we will,"

we think, as we expressed ourselves in the outset, that the hand of God has been in the synodical action which we have endeavored to sketch, and has directed it to the present is-

sues. It has defeated all the measures calculated to *separate* brethren of the same faith, by the organization of rival colleges and Theological Seminaries, either within or beyond the limits of this State, and has favored those which tended to *unite* them in the support of the Institutions at Gettysburg; whilst it has not thus conducted to a favorable result, those intended to produce a union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. Thus our whole church in Pennsylvania has but *one* College and *one* Theological Seminary; the two Synods, each for a period acting for itself, like Naomi and Ruth, have again, in the providence of God, been united, and that man in his boldness, is little to be envied, who would propose a violent disruption of these kindred elements, instead of saying: "*What God has joined together, let not man put asunder.*"

It follows, therefore, that we ought to give our united efforts, and offer up our united prayers in behalf of these Institutions, carefully avoiding everything calculated to disturb the peace, or impair the charity which ought ever to exist between those professing to have *one Lord, one faith, one baptism*. If such action and such feelings existed among us in their proper measure, these Institutions of the church would soon occupy a far higher eminence than they do at present, become a still greater blessing and ornament to this generation, a rich legacy to our most distant posterity. May all of our people be disposed to labor together for the accomplishment of this desirable end, in the exercise of the largest charity consistent with truth, for this Christian grace thus exercised, will be a golden chain of sufficient extent, to bind us in sweet harmony together, for she *beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things!*

ARTICLE IV.

REMINISCENCES OF LUTHERAN CLERGYMEN.

XLIV.

JOHN GEORGE BUTLER.

"And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever."

FORTY-THREE years have passed away since the death of this faithful and laborious servant of Christ, yet there are some still living, to whom his memory is very precious, and who distinctly remember his active, anxious and self-denying efforts to build up the interests of our Zion, and to extend the boundaries of the Redeemer's kingdom. Although his body, for a long period, has mingled with its kindred dust, his influence for good continues to be felt in the life of many who survive, whilst there is reason to believe that there are redeemed spirits in the realms of bliss, who trace their first heavenly impulses on earth to his earnest prayers and Christian efforts, and who are now his "glory and joy," his "crown of rejoicing," in the celestial world.

Mr. Butler was born in Philadelphia in 1754, many years before we had an existence as a nation. He was left an orphan at the early age of two years, yet he was not entirely friendless. The God of the fatherless did not leave or forsake him. Friends were raised up to watch over his desolate path, who were ready to sympathize with him in his lonely condition, and to bring a cheering and helping hand to his relief. His mother had been a member of the German church, the pastor of which took a deep interest in the boy's welfare, and from time to time imparted to him faithful religious instruction. He endeavored to instil into his youthful mind a sense of the being of God, and of the reverence which is due him, of the love of the Savior and his infinite merits, and of the duty of prayer and the manner, in which it should be performed at the throne of grace. He tried to impress upon his heart Scriptural views of the object of life, and to withdraw his affections from the perishable things of earth to those of heaven, more substantial and enduring. These instructions were not lost. Their power was felt in his life, and while the dews of the morning were yet fresh upon his brow,

he consecrated his heart to the Lord, and cast in his lot with the people of God. His course in manhood was, in no small measure, the result of his training in youth, and his whole subsequent character was the ever ripening fruit of seed planted in his mind when a child.

In his early years, the subject of our sketch was apprenticed to a potter. At this business he continued, until his services were called into requisition, during the Revolutionary war. Deeply interested in the principles involved in the issue, he hesitated not to take the field in their defence. He did not, however, permit his religious character to suffer, whilst he was connected with the army. He was never ashamed or afraid, under any circumstances, to avow his Christian principles. Those who were associated with him, could tell that he had been with Jesus, and was imbued with his Spirit. His exemplary life in the camp was a beautiful and consistent exemplification of the excellence and power of religion. But the scenes which he witnessed from day to day, were not very congenial to his views and feelings. He was often shocked with the profanity which he heard, and the vices which prevailed. He could not connive at these violations of the Divine law, and he never failed to lift up his voice of disapprobation and remonstrance. On one occasion he greatly incurred the displeasure and odium of the Captain of the company of which he was a member, in consequence of a rebuke he administered to him for taking God's name in vain. He may be said here, in the army, to have made a beginning in preaching the Gospel. He seemed all the time interested in the subject of religion, and constantly sought opportunities to arrest the progress of iniquity, and to advance the cause of truth and righteousness.

He left the army after a brief service, and commenced the regular study of Divinity, under the direction of his pastor, Rev. Dr. Helmuth. In due time he was licensed as a minister of the Gospel, by the Synod of Pennsylvania, and soon after took charge of our Lutheran interests in Carlisle and congregations in the vicinity. Carlisle was, at the time, a frontier village, and our church a field only for missionary operations. The Revolutionary war had scarcely been brought to a termination, and its disastrous influence upon the community had not yet passed away. Its effects were to be seen in the prostitution of morals, and the indifference that every where existed in reference to religion. Mr. Butler began his

duties conscious of the pressure of accountability, and in reliance upon the Divine aid. He gave himself up thoroughly to the work, and labored indefatigably for the salvation of souls. Notwithstanding the poverty, trials, struggles and toils, incident to his difficult position, he was happy, and had reason to rejoice, that his efforts to do good were not fruitless. He was also, whilst a resident of Pennsylvania, pastor of the Lutheran Church in Shippensburg, and was, for a time, employed in visiting destitute portions of the church in the western part of the State, dispersed in the territory now known as Huntingdon, Blair, Bedford and Somerset counties. Much of his time was spent in Apostolic journeys, as an itinerant missionary of the Synod with which he was connected, in gathering together our members, establishing congregations, instructing the young in the Catechism, preaching the word and administering the sacraments. He was highly esteemed for his works of faith and labors of love. In some churches of our communion which he organized, his services are still kindly remembered, and his praises spoken by many of the aged, who are yet spared as a connecting link between the past and the present.

We next find this laborious and faithful servant of God in the State of Virginia, there exploring our waste places, and breaking to the destitute the bread of life. He was annually commissioned by the Synod of Pennsylvania to travel through the western part of Virginia and Tennessee, to look after our members, to remain for a season at such places as furnished a prospect of usefulness, to catechise and confirm the young, to distribute copies of the Bible and the Hymn Book, of which he usually carried with him a large supply, and to organize congregations wherever practicable. He had Botetourt County as his head-quarters, but he was constantly engaged in missionary labors. His several appointments were generally made a year in advance, and were most punctually filled. So conscientious was he in this respect, that he was often at the post of duty, when he could easily have pleaded physical infirmity as an adequate cause for the failure of the engagement. It is recollected that, on one occasion, he rode with a pillow placed on his saddle, rather than disappoint those who, he knew, would be assembled for the service. With the same conscientious fidelity he discharged all his obligations. Nothing could ever tempt him to swerve from the path of duty. He followed his convictions in spite of clamor or misrepresentation. His notions of right and wrong were

based upon the laws of religion and of God, and not upon the maxims and policy of the world. He was fearless in re-proving iniquity, and would never, in any way, countenance what he knew to be wrong. Intemperance at this period was a prevalent and fashionable vice in Botetourt County, but he did not shrink to declare his uncompromising hostility to the practice, and to expose its sinfulness. His boldness in presenting the truth, sometimes aroused against him opposition and even persecution, but he cared not for the taunts or the sneers, the complaints or the maledictions of men, provided he could have a conscience void of offence.

"Assailed by scandal and the tongue of strife,
His only answer was a blameless life;
And he who forged and he who threw the dart,
Had each a brother's interest in his heart."

He realized that he was "about his Masters's business," and would be required to render an account of his stewardship to Him, in whose service he was engaged.

In 1805 the subject of our narrative removed to Cumberland, Md. This congregation was organized in 1794, and supplied with occasional visitations by members of the Pennsylvania Synod. It had no regular pastor until Mr. Butler assumed the charge. He entered upon his duties with his characteristic zeal and energy. His labors here were owned and blessed. The Great Head of the church was pleased to employ him as an instrument for doing a good work for the church to which his services had been devoted, and many souls were brought to a saving acquaintance with the truth as it is in Jesus. His preaching was of a most heart-searching and pungent character.

"He preached
Conversion and repentance, as to souls
In prison, under dangers imminent!"

A favorite expression with him in the pulpit, when addressing the impenitent, was, "Turn or burn! Repent and believe or be damned!" His manner sometimes appeared stern, and his language rough, but the force of circumstances, the character of the population, and the state of things that prevailed at that time, rendered it necessary for him to speak plainly and pointedly. He ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears, and to beseech the wanderer from God to

turn from his evil ways and live. The timid and irresolute were encouraged to persevere in that which was right, the afflicted were comforted, the distressed relieved, and the careless and obdurate arrested in their course. Cases apparently the most hopeless, were reached; individuals far sunk in vice, the reckless and debased, were reclaimed, and many rejoiced that they were rescued from ruin, delivered from the power of darkness, and introduced into the marvellous light of the Gospel. He seemed to feel his responsibilities as an ambassador of Christ, a steward of the mysteries of God. In the pulpit and in his catechetical instructions, he insisted strongly upon a change of heart. The doctrines of human depravity, the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and justification by faith, were always kept prominently in view. Not only was union with the church represented as important, but union with Christ, as the Head of the church, by a living, active faith, still more important. He usually made a deep impression upon the hearts of his catechumens, and they seldom separated from him without being greatly moved and bathed in tears. His ministerial labors were connected with scenes of deep and eternal interest, and identified with genuine revivals of religion. He prayed and toiled for the enlargement of Zion, and for the awakening and conversion of immortal souls. Had he lived at a later period, he would have been considered a decidedly *New Measure* man. He sometimes used what is, at the present day, called the *Anxious Bench*, and was in the habit of having members of his church lead in the devotions at the social meeting for prayer. He taught them, at the very commencement of their Christian course, to take up the cross, and perform the duty, however painful, and they were often reminded of their personal responsibility to God for the keeping of their brethren, and the progress of the cause of truth. He did all in his power to promote the zeal and activity of private Christians, and to secure their coöperation in furthering evangelical piety in the church and the community. We subjoin an extract from a letter written by him in 1811, and published in the *Evangelische Magazin*,* which will give an idea, not only of the sacrificing labors, evangelical spirit and ardent piety of this pioneer of Lutheranism, but also of the condition of our church at this period, in what were then regarded as frontier settlements. The editor, Dr. Helmuth, in introducing the

* Vol. I. 18.

communication to the attention of his readers, remarks that it will afford them an opportunity of seeing how, here and there, in this western world, the spirit of religion shows itself of an active character. "It will be," says Mr. Butler, "six years, next October, since I live here. I serve at present eight congregations. Of these, one is forty-seven and another sixty miles from the place of my residence. I receive from all these congregations about one hundred and fifty dollars. I was requested, in August, 1807, to hold divine service some miles from my home. With the consent of my principal congregation, I set out on my journey. — I was absent six weeks, traveling and preaching. And, blessed be the Lord! who assisted me, and crowned my labors with his blessing to old and young. I instructed a number of young persons in the catechism; and the nearer the close of the course of instruction approached, so much the nearer did God come near us with his blessing, so that very often our hearts were melted, and one flood of tears followed another. The Lord moved my heart and tongue, and gave me grace so to speak as never before. On Friday previous to communion, whilst I preached in the forenoon with great freedom, from the words, 'Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled,' God approached us in a special manner, and several of my hearers were powerfully affected; and towards the close of this afternoon's instruction, the King of glory came to us and wrought a powerful awakening. In short, the following three days were blessed days, during which, in the hearts of the aged and young, the Lord kindled a fire that burns still to the praise of his name. In October, 1809, I was called to a place sixty miles from this place, to instruct children. On Tuesday, previous to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, God came specially near to us. I thought I could perceive that some of the children would like to speak to me alone, did not fear prevent them. Hence, I exhorted them, that if they desired to disclose to me anything resting upon their hearts and conscience, they should not fear at all or be ashamed to do so, but should be free and open-hearted towards me. This evening I went home with six of the catechumens. After supper, one of them came to me and said, 'Sir, I wish to speak with you alone.' I went, and found the young person awakened and deeply wounded in heart. So soon as the rest saw this, a divine arrow seemed to penetrate the hearts of them all. I found one of them to be in the deepest anguish on account of

his sins. I pointed him directly to Jesus, the friend of sinners. He desired me to pray for him. I called together all the other catechumens, and prayed; but in a very few moments, I could not hear my own voice, by reason of their weeping and crying for grace and mercy. I arose and permitted them and our blessed God to treat with each other alone. They prayed in one strain for a whole hour, and one of the children prayed two hours, when all its strength was exhausted. And such child-like, spiritual and persevering prayers as these were, I have never heard from the lips of either minister or hearer. In short, God did here begin a work, such as I cannot and shall not attempt to describe, lest it may be regarded as something incredible. On my way home, I held a prayer-meeting in another congregation. Here eleven persons prayed, one after another, very fervently and perseveringly. The Lord came near us, and kindled a fire among us. An aged woman fell upon her knees, weeping and crying out, 'O dear pastor! pray for me—I am a poor, lost sinner.' Another woman, whom I confirmed some time ago, and who is believed, if I have a God-fearing soul in all my congregations, to be that soul,—this woman was again powerfully awakened and incited to ever increasing earnestness in religion. Here too the fire still burns. On the last Sabbath in October, 1808, I held a general meeting of all the catechumens from all my congregations. At this meeting the Lord kindled a holy fire, which he had also carried to other neighborhoods, and which continues to burn. Again, on the last Sabbath in August, 1810, I held in town a general meeting of the catechumens. This meeting continued three days. We saw here wonderful displays of the grace of God. The convicted, weeping, mourning and praying were seen everywhere. Some cried out, 'O God! what shall we do to be saved?' Others asked, weeping, 'Is there yet salvation for us?' All this, taken together, greatly offended the old serpent and his adherents, so that there was no lack of scolding, mocking, slandering, blaspheming and lying. Hence I have had to wade continually, and already for a whole year, through deep waters."

Mr. Butler continued to labor at Cumberland till death terminated his earthly pilgrimage. As he advanced in life he grew in spirituality and ripened for heaven. Every thought and impulse of his soul seemed schooled in subordination to the will of his Heavenly Father. For years before his death his mind was completely taken up with religious subjects, and

ordinary themes of social intercourse were very much excluded. If a secular or worldly topic were introduced, it appeared to have no relish for him. He soon endeavored to change the conversation and turn it into some serious channel. *Aliud nihil, nisi cælum.* His views and feelings in prospect of death, were what might be expected to mark the departure of such a man. Peacefully and joyfully he bade adieu to friends on earth, in the joyful expectation of spending an eternity in heaven. He died December 12th, 1816, in the sixty-third year of his age. "He rests from his labors and his works do follow him."

In personal appearance, Mr. Butler was about the middle height, broad built, compactly formed, producing the impression of health and strength. He was married in early life to Catharine Miller, of Philadelphia, and was the father of six children, four sons and two daughters, all of whom became hopefully pious, verifying the promised blessing upon the house of the righteous. "The generation of the upright shall be blessed." He was most faithful in his family instructions, and rigid in enforcing discipline. Gideon entered the ministry the latter part of his life, and was, like his father, an earnest and faithful herald of salvation. The sons were generally active in the church. The youngest, a devoted and worthy elder, and Superintendent of the Sabbath School, at Cumberland, was the father of Rev. J. G. Butler, pastor of the Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C.

The testimony respecting the subject of our narrative, received from different sources, is, that he was a man of deep-toned, fervid piety, a man of prayer, of communion with God, and love to Christ and the church, the friend of vital religion, zealous and active in the work to which he had consecrated his powers, earnest and persevering in his exertions to do good, and laborious and faithful until death. His aim ever seemed to be, to do what is right. So manifest was this, that no one would have ventured to approach him with an improper or questionable proposition. The burden of his heart and the purpose of his life, was to honor Christ in the salvation of the soul. He faithfully and successfully fulfilled the duties of the ministry. His life furnishes a beautiful illustration of the power of prayer and the influence of personal effort.

Mr. Butler was a member of the Pennsylvania Synod, and seldom failed to be present at its annual meetings. He was one of the first of our ministers who introduced English into

the exercises of public worship, and preached regularly in that language. He was censured by many for his course, and in consequence of it, was often the victim of persecution. Satisfied, however, as to the propriety of the measure, he could not be persuaded to abandon it. He felt that the strong prejudice against the introduction of English into the services of the sanctuary, existing in the minds of many, must yield, and a different and more liberal policy adopted, or our church could never prosper or be extended in this country. He preached in the English language quite fluently. "I remember," says Dr. Kurtz, "that the first time I heard him, I supposed he must have lived in Ireland, or learned to speak from associating with Irish, so little were his pronunciation and accent like those of a German or an American." He was a plain, practical, pungent preacher, and appeared well versed in the Scriptures, from which he frequently quoted and drew illustrations. He presented the truth with unaffected simplicity and great clearness, but with boldness, earnestness and power. Fearless and unshrinking in the discharge of every duty, prompt in meeting his engagements, diligent in the improvement of opportunities, he did not live in vain. Much good resulted from influences which he put into operation. Many a poor wanderer was conducted to the realms of glory through his instrumentality, and fitted for eternal activity and enjoyment.

Mr. Butler kept a regular journal of his labors and trials, which contained a considerable amount of information relative to himself and our church, during the period of his ministry. It was, however, unfortunately destroyed during the great conflagration of 1833, which laid nearly the whole town of Cumberland in ashes. The only production we have from his pen, is a discourse on the "Duty of True-Heart Prayer," published in 1784, whilst pastor in Carlisle, and designed for circulation among his own people.* If his sermons generally, were of the same character, we are not surprised that he was so efficient and successful a laborer in the vineyard of the Lord.

* The Duty of True-Heart Prayer briefly considered and earnestly enforced: By Rev. John George Butler. Translated by Rev. David H. Focht, A. M.—1854.

XLV.

GEORGE DANIEL FLOHR.

"I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."

The subject of our present sketch was born in the year 1759. He died in 1826, in the sixty-seventh year of his age. Although he had nearly reached his fortieth year when he entered upon the sacred office, yet during the period he was permitted to labor, he accomplished much more than many whose ministerial career extends over a larger space. He is represented as having been a good man, a "living epistle known and read of all men," and a judicious, devoted and useful minister of the Gospel, "whose praise is" still "throughout all the churches." Hundreds yet live, who remember him, and always speak of him with the most tender regard, who mourn for him as they knew him in life, and testify to the earnestness and fidelity with which he discharged his duties.

Mr. Flohr was by birth a German, but of his parentage and early history, we have no information. We find him, in 1793, in Paris, engaged in the study of Medicine, under the instruction of his uncle, who was a Physician. He was a resident of France during that memorable period, which convulsed the whole nation; he witnessed the intense excitement which filled all Paris with consternation, and caused the eye to quail, the voice to falter, and the heart to shudder in the presence of the armed soldiery, and the yells of the populace. On the fatal morning of the execution of Louis XVI, he was one of the vast throng, and with the multitude, gazed upon the terrific and woe-stricken scenes. On this occasion, the accidental but tragical death of an individual in the crowd, standing near him, part of whose mangled body was thrown upon his person, most deeply affected him, and so operated upon his mind, as to lead him to change all his purposes and plans for the future. He at once abandons his medical studies, and resolves to turn his attention to other pursuits. This, perhaps, formed the turning-point in his life, and awa-

kened a train of serious thought which resulted in his subsequent consecration to the Christian ministry.

Soon after this he immigrated to this country, and we next meet with him in Madison County, Virginia, prosecuting the study of Theology, under the direction of Rev. William Carpenter. Subsequently he taught school in Culpepper County until his preparations for the ministry were completed. He was then licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Pennsylvania, and engaged for a season in missionary services in South-Western Virginia. This field of labor was not only rich to him in experience, but it was among the scenes of his most useful efforts. In the year 1799, having been invited to settle as Pastor of several congregations in Wythe County, he accepted the call, and immediately entered upon his duties. Here he continued zealously and faithfully to labor for years. The charge was extensive, the position laborious. It embraced five organized congregations, to whom he statedly preached, not only on the Lord's day, but frequently during the week. His churches lay in three different counties, and the most of them were separated some distance from his residence—one nine, another twenty-two, a third thirty, and a fourth forty-seven miles. Some of these churches he was obliged to relinquish the latter part of his life, in consequence of declining health, but the congregation near his home he retained until the last. He was never satisfied unless employed, and his voice was heard in the sanctuary, proclaiming the precious truths of God's word within a few weeks of his death. He died after a brief illness. He met the final summons not only with calm submission, but with holy triumph, bearing the clearest and most joyful testimony to the all-sustaining grace of his blessed Redeemer.

Is that a death-bed where the Christian lies?

Yes, but not his: 'Tis death itself there dies!

The old warrior put off his armor, for the battle was fought, the victory won. It is said that no death ever occurred in that whole region of country, which produced so profound a sensation and so universal grief. An immense concourse of people came together, even from remote points, to look for the last time upon the countenance of the loved and departed one, who had so long and so faithfully ministered to them in holy things, and animated them in their Christian pilgrimage, by the hopes and consolations of the Gospel. Although the

cemetery attached to St. John's Church, in which his remains were deposited, was more than a mile from his residence, his friends, influenced by a feeling of high regard, insisted upon carrying the bier on their shoulders, the whole distance to the grave. Two sermons were preached on the occasion, the one by Rev. Mr. Houck, of the German Reformed Church, in the German language, the other by Rev. Mr. Chut, of the Presbyterian Church, in the English language. A simple but beautiful monument, carved out of the mountain-marble, has since been erected to his memory, by Mr. Crone, of Wythe County, a member of the German Reformed Church, at his own expense, as a memorial of private friendship, and a tribute to great excellencies, piety and usefulness, appreciated by the whole community.

The widow of Mr. Flohr, who was highly esteemed, was buried only a few months ago. They laid her beside her revered and still lamented husband, and in connexion with the funeral services, the Pastor* uttered the following sentiment, which found a response in every heart present: "We now consign to the grave the venerable partner of that great and good man, to whose faithful ministry and holy life, this Christian Church and community are more indebted than, perhaps, to any other man, living or dead!"

Mr. Flohr exercised extraordinary influence, not only upon the members of his church, but upon all classes of society.

"A man he was to all the country dear!"

He had the unlimited confidence of the community in which he dwelt, and with every one his word seemed to be the highest authority. When difficulties arose in the church or out of it, all were willing to refer the subject to the venerable Pastor for adjustment, and to abide by his decision, and from it scarcely any one ever thought of an appeal. In matters of local interest, where difference of opinion necessarily existed, he was often chosen to act as umpire, because all were satisfied that his judgment would be in accordance with the principles of equity. He was, on all these occasions, recognized as lawyer, judge and jury. Even now—more than thirty years since he passed away—his influence is felt, his sentiments quoted, and his views tenaciously regarded. "When I sometimes," writes one of his successors in the pastoral office, "step aside from the old landmarks of Lutheranism, I

* Rev. J. A. Brown, Pastor of the Lutheran Church, Wytheville, Va.

am immediately met with the remark, 'Father Flohr did not do so!'

His house was the regular place of resort for those who were distressed, either in body or mind. His counsels were most highly valued, and his suggestions generally adopted. He was able to give advice, he knew how to sympathize with the afflicted, and to comfort the sorrowing. There is a good old member of the Methodist Church, yet living in Wythe County, who says that when he was young, and first became interested in the subject of religion, he at one time was in deep distress, and almost desponded in reference to the result. He went, however, to Mr. Flohr for counsel and direction, presented his case, and then asked him whether he thought there was any hope possible for him. Mr. Flohr walked up to him, laid his hand upon his shoulder and said, "I would to God that *all* could be brought to feel just as you now do!" "In that interview," says the old man, "I received the very instruction I needed, and soon my heart was comforted, and I was made happy."

If it be asked, how it was, that this man exerted so unbounded an influence, we reply that its basis was the confidence which every one had in his personal worth and Christian character. His integrity was above suspicion. "He walked in the furnace and the smell of fire was not upon his garments." His walk and conversation corresponded with his principles. They were a beautiful commentary upon the truths of religion. "I was brought up," writes one,* "in the neighborhood in which he labored and died, and now occupy part of the field which he cultivated, and I have never yet heard a single charge of impropriety or indiscretion preferred against him. All, even those who differed from him in some of his views, say that he was an upright man, and incapable of an intentional wrong." If you were to decide whether he would pursue any particular course of conduct, or aim at any particular object, it were only necessary to inquire whether he would regard that object as right, or that aim Scriptural, and you could rest assured that no mean or selfish consideration, or sinister purpose, would interfere to bias his judgment or lead him astray. There were no false appearances about him: He had none of that disguise or policy in his composition, sometimes found in men occupying high positions.

* Rev. J. A. Brown, of Wytheville, Va.

What he thought he felt and spoke. There was in his character a transparent simplicity, a cordial sincerity—

——“a clear and ready smile
Unshadowed by a thought of guile”——

which struck all who were brought in contact with him. He was a man of an elevated, ardent piety, and fervent devotion to the cause of his Master—fixed and unwavering in his principles of faith and of duty—earnest in his prayers and efforts to do good, to diffuse human happiness and advance the interests of Christ's kingdom.

Mr. Flohr possessed many estimable qualities. He was amiable in his disposition and affable in his manners. He had the benevolence that delights in the good of others, and is willing to make sacrifices to promote it. His intercourse was characterized by great courtesy and kindness, always united with dignity and deep seriousness. He never indulged in levity or trifling conversation. His company was courted, but he was not disposed to mingle much in society, except when duty required it, and he could render it subservient to some useful purpose. He was a most laborious man, and seemed constantly engaged. This was necessary, as the calls upon his attention were numerous, and his duties onerous. His diocese was large, and at one time embraced nearly the whole territory now occupied by the Synod of Western Virginia. He was regular and systematic in all his habits, carefully accurate in everything he did, and observed punctuality in his engagements with great precision. Inclement weather or bad roads did not prevent him from filling his appointments. Even when advanced in years, he would sometimes ride twenty or thirty miles, through wind and rain, sleet and mud, to meet the beloved people committed to his pastoral care :

“To them his heart, his love, his griefs were given.”

He neither desired, nor would he have accepted of a dispensation from the most intense labor, or the heaviest sacrifice, if required for promoting the object to which he had devoted himself. He also possessed gifts considered essential to eminent usefulness in a minister of the Gospel. He was deeply interested in his work, and took special care of the lambs of his flock. To gather them together in the Church, for the purpose of giving them religious instruction, was one of his

chief pleasures. He strictly and faithfully observed the good old usage of catechization, which from the beginning has existed in our church, assured from the experience of his own labors, that this instrumentality "had been owned and blessed of God to the salvation of thousands." In his lectures to catechumens, he is said to have been peculiarly happy. The Catechism was not passed over mechanically, as is too often the practice, but he tried to have every part of it not only carefully committed to memory, but thoroughly understood and impressed upon the heart.

In his views of Divine truth he was sound. No one ever questioned his orthodoxy. There was also a truly catholic spirit, happily blended with his evangelical faith. His large heart embraced all in the common faith and love of Christ, by whatever name called, who walked in the footsteps of their Master, and were imbued with his spirit.

His efforts in the pulpit are represented as having been evangelical and earnest, characterized by great simplicity and directness, and delivered with much tenderness and force. He fearlessly proclaimed the whole counsel of God, and faithfully admonished his hearers in reference to the dangers to which they were exposed. He also knew how to comfort those who were mourning the absence of God's face, or were distressed in mind from other causes. The glory of God in the salvation of the soul, was the leading object, the impelling motive, which seemed to urge him on in all that he did.

As a scholar, Mr. Flohr was, by no means, deficient. His mind was well balanced, and all parts of it possessed nearly the same strength. He was fond of study, and diligently devoted his time to the acquisition of knowledge, so far as his professional engagements allowed. His acquaintance with the German and French was thorough and extensive, and his attainments in Latin and Greek quite respectable. The *Lutheran Intelligencer*, in an obituary published at the time of his death, speaks of him as a man of "great literary acquirements."

The subject of our narrative was of medium stature, rather tall, with a commanding figure, presenting a very reverential appearance, and commanding respect wherever he was seen. He was neat and tidy in his dress, and, in accordance with the custom of the times, wore long stockings with bright buckles at the knees and on his shoes. He occupied a pleasant country residence, to which, in the minds of those who knew its former tenant, a sacredness still attaches, in conse-

quence of the associations and reminiscences of the past. The countenance that once shed its cheering light, however, no longer diffuses its wonted charm through the house; the hand that was ever kindly extended to those who crossed its threshold, is motionless; the voice which gave so cordial a greeting to all, is silent, and the heart that beat with so warm a sympathy, is hushed in death; but influences there exerted, hopes inspired, and impulses awakened, still live! The house may moulder into ruin, and every thing around suffer decay, but these cannot yield to the corroding influence of time; the principles which he disseminated will not be destroyed—

"These shall resist the empire of decay
When time is o'er and worlds have passed away;
Cold in the dust the perished heart may lie,
But that which warmed it once, can never die!"

ARTICLE V.

SCHMID'S DOGMATIK OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

ACTUAL TRANSGRESSION.

SEC. 27. Original sin is the foundation and fountain of all actual transgressions: By these we are to understand, not only sins which manifest themselves in outward acts, but also those which depend only on the internal acts of man. Hütters. "Actual transgression is every act, whether external or internal, which conflicts with the law of God. (1) They are numerous and diversified, and are divided, according to Quenstedt, in the following manner:

I. "In respect of an internal defective cause in the agents, into *voluntary and involuntary*. A *voluntary sin* is an act by which man transgresses the divine law, by a deliberate volition, contrary to the dictates of conscience. *Involuntary sin* is an act not conformed to the law, and not having proceeded from certain knowledge, nor from a deliberate volition." Involuntary sin is again divided into sins of *ignorance and of infirmity*. (2)

II. "In respect of a sinner supposed to transgress, 1) into *our own sins and the sins of others*. Our own sins are those

which we ourselves contract, either by doing what has been prohibited, or by omitting to do what was commanded. They are called the sins of others, in heart they are indeed perpetrated by others, but we communicate with them, or are participants in them. (3): 2) into *venial* and *mortal*. *Venial sins* are those which, as soon as they are committed, and at the very moment when they are perpetrated, have pardon connected with them by an indissoluble bond. *Mortal sins* are those which produce spiritual death at the very moment when they are committed. (4)

III. *In respect of the material (in qua) in which they are committed*, they are divided into *internal* and *external*. *Internal* are those of the heart: *external* are those of word and deed. (5)

IV. *In respect of the material about which (circa quam) they are committed*; into sins against the first table immediately and directly, and against the second table (i. e.) against God, against a neighbor, and against the proper person itself of the transgressor.

V. *In respect of the sinful act itself*: into sins of commission and of omission. *Sins of commission* are those which consist in positive acts which come into conflict with a negative precept. *Sins of omission* consist in the refusal or omission of acts which are presented by a positive precept.—Beahr. (6)

VI. *In respect of the effect*: into sins which cry out for punishment, and those which do not. Of the former kind are vicious acts which provoke God to revenge, although the men were silent or only conniving at them. The latter are those which God endures through his long-suffering, and either postpones the punishment, or if they are no longer committed by the regenerate, he forgives. (7)

VII. *In respect of their adjuncts*, sins are divided into, 1) *more or less grievous*, (on account of the greater or less fault or deformity connected with them) (8): 2) into *secret* and *manifest*; 3) into *dead* and *living*. (9) *Dead sins* are those which indeed remain in us, but are not known as sins, or certainly not as great as they really are. *Living sins* are those which are known to be such, and rage even after the knowledge of the law.—Rom. 7: 8, 9; 4) into *remaining* and *remitted sins*. A *remaining sin* is that which yet oppresses the sinner by its guilt and weight. A *remitted sin* is that whose guilt has been removed from the sinner, by the grace of God, for the sake of the merits of Christ; 5) into

sins connected with hardness of heart and blindness of mind, and those unconnected with them (10); 6) into pardonable and unpardonable sins. Of the latter class there is only the sin against the Holy Ghost. (11) This sin consists in a malicious denial, a hostile attack, and a horrid blasphemy of divine truth, evidently known and approved by conscience, and an obstinate and finally persevering rejection of all the means of salvation. Hollaz. Matt. 12: 31, 32; Mark 3: 28, 29; Luke 12: 10; Heb. 6: 4, 6; 10: 26-29.

NOTES ON THIS SECTION.

(1.) *Calovius*.—"Actual sin is a departure from the law, by which human thoughts and actions proceeding from the flesh, transgress the divine law given by Moses, and thus it exposes the transgressor to temporal and eternal punishment."

Hollaz.—"Actual sin is a turning away from the rule of the divine law, of a human act either committed or omitted, which incurs guilt and exposure to punishment."

Quenstedt.—"The word act and actual, in this place, is used not strictly for external acts only, and sins of commission, but with such latitude that it embraces also internal vicious emotions, both primary and secondary, and also sins of omission.

In the sacred Scriptures, actual sins are called *works of the flesh*, Gal. 5: 19; *unfruitful works of darkness*, Eph. 5: 11; *deeds of the old man*, Col. 3: 9; *dead works*, Heb. 6: 1; 9: 14; *unlawful deeds*, 2 Pet. 2: 8."

(2.) Here these additional remarks are to be added: a) *Quenstedt*. "Sin is here called voluntary, not because it is with the will or in the will, for thus also involuntary violations of duty would be voluntary, but it is thus understood as opposed to that which is done through ignorance and inconsiderately." b) *Hollaz*. "Voluntary sin is viewed both in respect of conscience, and in respect of the purpose of the will. Sin against conscience is fourfold. For it is committed either against a *correct conscience*, when a man, either by action or omission, does not follow, but despises the dictate of conscience when it agrees with the divine law; or against an *erroneous conscience*, when a man, either by action or omission, turns away from the dictate of conscience imbued in error; or against a *probable conscience*, when any one is delinquent contrary to the dictate of the intellect, which

urges, for probable reasons, that something should be done or omitted now and at this place; or against a *doubtful conscience*, when any one does or omits that, concerning which it is doubtful whether it should be done or omitted. *Voluntary sin*, in respect of the purpose of the will, is viewed in a twofold aspect. *The one* is that which is committed from mere malice and a will plainly free: *The other* is that which is committed under the power of a will influenced by force or fear, and by surrounding dangers.—Matt. 26: 70, 72, 74; Mark 14: 68, 70, 71; Luke 22: 57, 58, 60; John 18: 25, 27." c) *Involuntary sins* are, 1. *Sins of ignorance*, which overtake the regenerate unwilling, in consequence of the darkness of the mind, which has not been yet entirely removed by the illumination of the *Holy Spirit*. 2. *Sins of infirmity*, which overtake the regenerate without any certain purpose of sinning, such are sinful emotions of the mind, which have suddenly arisen in the regenerate unwilling, and whatever unlawful words or deeds are the result of inadvertence or precipitancy, and contrary to the purpose of the will. Gen. 9: 21; 16: 5; 18: 12; Numbers 20: 11, 12; Acts 15: 39; Rom. 7: 15; Gal. 2: 12, 13, 14; 6: 1."

(3.) *Hollaz*.—"Our own sin is a vicious act, produced by a real influence of our own; the sin of another imputed to us, is an unlawful act, to the production of which we concur indeed by no real influence, yet by an efficacious intention, so that it can justly be imputed to us. (He concurs, by efficacious intention, in the sin of another, who commands, consults, connives, and who does not oppose, or give information, and thus is the moral cause of the sin of another) Eph. 5: 7 and 11; 1 Tim. 5: 22; 2 John 11; Apocalypse 18: 4."

(4.) *Hollaz*.—"a) *Venial sin* is every involuntary sin in the regenerate, which neither removes the indwelling grace of the *Holy Spirit*, nor extinguishes faith, but in the moment in which it is committed, has pardon connected with it by an indissoluble bond. The distinction of sin into mortal and venial, does not arise from the demerit of sin, for every sin, of itself, and by its own nature, in a court of law is damnable: But 1) from the different conditions of the subject, or the person sinning. For a venial sin is committed by the regenerate, a mortal sin by those who either never were regenerated or, having been overcome by the predominating power of the flesh, fell from a state of grace. 2) From the estimate which God has made in the Gospel; because God, a reconciled and gracious father, does not impute to the regenerate sins of in-

firmity and ignorance, as a crime to be punished. 3) From the event. A mortal sin precipitates the sinner into a state of wrath, death and condemnation, so that, if he should die in this state, and without repentance, he would be certainly condemned; but a venial sin, because it has individual pardon as a companion, can consist with the grace of God and saving faith. The causes of forgiveness or non-imputation are, the compassion of God, the satisfaction and intercession of Christ (1 John 2: 1, 2; Rom. 8: 1), the efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit, and the daily penitence of the regenerate." b) A mortal sin is that by which the regenerate, having been overcome by the flesh, and thus, not remaining in a regenerate state, transgress the divine law by a deliberate purpose of the will, contrary to the dictates of conscience, and thereby lose saving faith, reject the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit, and cast themselves into a state of wrath, death and condemnation."

(5.) Hollaz.—"Sins of the heart are depraved thoughts and desires which are cherished within the human breast: sins of the lips are wicked words and gestures expressed by the lips: sins of deed are actions which are performed contrary to the divine law, by an external effort of the members. Matt. 5: 21, 22."

(6.) Hollaz.—"Sins of commission are positive acts, by which the negative precepts of God are violated. Sins of omission are the neglect of acts prescribed by the affirmative precepts of God.—James 4: 16, 17. Note. Although there is oftentimes, in a sin of omission, a certain improper positive act, or internal act of the will; as, for example, to will to omit what had been commanded; or an external act, as an operation by which any one is hindered from that which he ought to do. Yet such a positive act is not always nor necessarily sought after, but it is sin for one not to do what has been commanded."

(7.) Hollaz.—"Outcriving sins are the following, the Scriptures being witness: 1) The fratricide committed by Cain. Gen. 4: 10. 2) The sins of the Sodomites.—Gen. 18: 20. 3) The oppression of the Israelites in Egypt.—Exod. 3: 9; of widows and orphans.—Exod. 22: 22. 4) The denial of wages due to hirelings.—James 5: 4."

(8.) Hollaz.—"One sin is more grievous than another:—1) In respect of the efficient cause or person sinning. A Christian sins more grievously than a heathen, though he commit the same crime. 2) In respect of the impelling cause.

He who commits adultery with his neighbor's wife, for the sake of gratifying his lust, sins more grievously than he who steals when compelled by hunger. 3) In respect of the object. He is more guilty who slays his father than he who slays an enemy. 4) In respect of the law. He sins more grievously who violates the first table of the law, than he who violates the second. 5) In respect of the effect. That sin is regarded as the more grievous, which is attended with the greater injury."

(9.) *Hollaz.*—"A *secret sin* is that which is either unknown to the person himself who sins, or which is known only to him who sins, and a few others who wish it suppressed. An *open sin* is that which is known by many, and, if it be connected with offence to others, is called a *scandal*. A *scandal* is an open sin which furnishes an occasion of sinning to those who know it. It is usually divided into *given or active scandal*, and *received or passive*. The former is an open sin which is the occasion of sinning to others; the latter is a word or deed of another, not in itself evil, by which others are offended, or take occasion to sin."

(10.) *Hollaz.*—"Sin, connected with hardness of heart, is the most atrocious of all, by which the mind of man, having been polluted, remains averse to the word of God and blind, the will, confirmed in wickedness, resists the Holy Spirit, the appetite indulges in beastly pleasures, and sins to such a degree that, being with difficulty or not at all corrigible, it brings upon itself temporal and eternal punishments. The cause of this hardness is not God; but partly the devil, who multiplies evils, blinds the mind, and fills the heart with wickedness—2 Cor. 4: 4; Acts 5: 3; Eph. 2: 2; partly man, who rejects the ordinary means of salvation, and is continually selling himself to the desire and practice of sin.—Matt. 13: 15." In reference to Exodus 7: 3, *Hollaz* remarks:—"God does not harden men *causally or effectively*, by sending hardness into their hearts, but *judicially, permissively and by forsaking them*. For the act of hardening is a judicial act, by which, on account of antecedent, voluntary and inevitable wickedness, God justly permits a man habitually wicked, to rush into greater crimes, and withdraws his grace from him, and finally delivers him up to the power of Satan, by whom he is afterwards driven on into greater sins, until he finally cuts him off from the right of the heavenly inheritance."

(11.) *Quenstedt.*—"The word Spirit here, is not received in the sense of essence, as a common name for the three per-

sons of the Deity, but it is used personally, for the third person of the Deity; yet respect being had, not so much to the person itself of the Holy Spirit, as if this sin were committed immediately against it, as to his office and blessings, for example, as far as he strives to illuminate men through the doctrines of the Gospel. . . Therefore, the Holy Spirit must here be viewed in relation to his office, and the sin is said to be against the Holy Spirit, partly in respect of his ministry, and partly in respect of his testimony.—Rom. 8: 16."

Gerhard.—"The sin against the Holy Ghost, therefore, is an intentional denial of evangelical truth, which was acknowledged and approved by conscience, connected with a bold attack upon it, and voluntary blasphemy of it. For we must observe, that this kind of sin was proved against the Pharisees by Christ; for although they were constrained, by the force of the truth uttered by him, and were convicted in their consciences by its illumination, yet they raged against him by their wicked impiety, to such a degree that they blushed not to ascribe his doctrines and miracles to Satan. The epistle to the Hebrews thus describes those who sin against the Holy Ghost, that they, having been previously illuminated, have also tasted the heavenly gift, and have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, also tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, yet afterwards fall away, and thus crucify to themselves afresh the Son of God, and put him to an open shame. Also that, by voluntary apostacy, they trample under foot the Son of God, and esteem his blood, by which they were sanctified, an unholy thing, and bring contempt upon the spirit of all grace."

Quenstedt.—"The form of the sin against the Holy Ghost consists, 1) In a denial of evangelical truth, which was evidently and sufficiently acknowledged and approved, and which denial was effected by a full, free and unimpeded exercise of the will.—Heb. 6: 4; 10: 26, 29. 2) In a hostile attack upon the same.—Matt. 12: 31, 32. 3) In voluntary and atrocious blasphemy.—Heb. 10: 26, 29." To this we must yet remark, that these essential requisites of this sin must always be taken conjointly, and never separately, and that then *that* must be called the sin against the Holy Ghost, concerning which all these can be conjointly verified. The following additional description flows from the nature of the subject: Not infants, but adults, commit this sin, who are not destitute of the revealed word of God, but having been illuminated and convicted by conscience of the certainty of di-

vine truth, yet have fallen from the desire and love of it into bitter hatred against it: to which Baehr adds, "either that doctrine was once approved by the assent of divine faith, and a public profession, or only was so clearly perceived that the mind having been convicted, had nothing which it could oppose to it. In the former mode, those apostates sin against the Holy Ghost, who deny the truth once acknowledged and believed, and utter reproaches against it, as Paul describes Heb. 6: 4. The Pharisees and Scribes belong to the latter class, who never, by their confession, approved of the doctrines of Christ. In the meantime, they were so convinced of their truth, from the Scriptures and the miracles of Christ, that they could oppose nothing but reproaches. As adjuncts of this sin, Quenstedt adds: 1) Final impenitence, Heb. 6: 4, 6; 2) Absolute irremissibleness, Matt. 12: 31; Mark 3: 28; Luke 12: 10; 3) Exclusion from prayer, 1 John 5: 16."

Hollaz.—"It is irremissible, not through any want of divine grace, or inadequacy of the atonement of Christ, or any want of the efficacious influence of the Holy Ghost, but on account of a wicked rejection of all the means of grace, and by reason of final impenitence. On the other hand, the sin against the Son of man is remissible.—Matt. 12: 32; Luke 12: 10. Quenstedt. "The sin against the Son of man is either a denial of the truth of the Gospel already acknowledged, concerning the Son of God, who became man, resulting from infirmity of the flesh, and fear of danger, but not united with a hostile attack and blasphemy, or an attack or blasphemy through ignorance of the truth not acknowledged.

ARTICLE VI.

History of the Christian Church. By Philip Schaff, D. D., &c. New York: Charles Scribner. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.—1859.

It is a gratifying circumstance that in the present state of the Christian Church, when so many conflicting sentiments prevail on religious subjects, the study of Church History is prosecuted with increased vigor. Among the human means which may be regarded as correctives of various abuses in doctrine and practice that are tolerated in numerous American

congregations, a wisely conducted study of Church History is unquestionably one of the most efficacious. The lights and shadows of Christian life are distinctly marked in the history of the Church in general, as well as in that of her individual members; while the former are full of encouragement to the believer, these shadows present most solemn warnings, which are well adapted, when they are conscientiously received, to expose and defeat the efforts of the great Adversary of man to injure the cause of holiness and truth. The English community has already been favored with translations of the works of several of the best of recent German Church historians (Gieseler, Neander, Hase, &c.). Still these are mere translations, and while there is something flattering to our pride in Dr. Schaff's remark, p. 25, that "America is, as yet, more engaged in making history, than in writing it," it does not console us for the long absence of original works. But we now have the pleasure of greeting a visitor who approaches us as one of our own citizens, addresses us in an original work in our own language, and, at the same time, exhibits such learning, ability, impartiality and general fitness for the difficult task of a Church historian, that we are induced by a sense of justice, to assign to him a rank equal to that of the first writers of the age. We think that the modest hope which the author of the work, the title of which is given above, expresses in his preface, is fulfilled—the work *does* meet a want in our theological literature, and *does* commend itself to the respectful attention of the American student.

The author first presents in the Table of Contents a sketch of the arrangement of his materials, which is characterized by great taste and skill; it is so natural and lucid, that the student at once surveys the whole field before him, and can, with the additional aid of a very full Index, which is appended to the volume, direct his steps with ease to any spot which may specially claim his attention. After the successful efforts of his predecessors, the author could not be expected to exhibit any novel features in the General Introduction of the work; this portion, corresponding to similar matter in Guericke, Kurtz, Lindner and the best writers, also includes the author's Division of Church History, and a "Literature" or brief account of leading authors on the subject. The determination of principal and subordinate periods of time, for the purpose of assisting the memory in the mechanical duty of retaining dates, varies more or less in all the authors, as no one seems willing to adopt his predecessor's system. We re-

gard this unwillingness to adopt the same series of epochs, as an unfortunate circumstance for the student who is disposed to consult more than one author—it deranges in his mind, to some extent, the regular succession of events, as he had at first conceived it. Both Hase and Kurtz, in the larger work of the latter, assign a prominent position to the age of Charlemagne; the personal, political and ecclesiastical importance of his great man, entitles him to such a distinction, independently of the circumstance that the date of his coronation, A. D. 800, is one easily retained by the memory. Dr. Schaff has preferred, on p. 14, a division which gives a predominating influence to the papal element; the ecclesiastical importance of Gregory I., Hildebrand, that is, Gregory VII., and Boniface VIII., (Innocent III. is not mentioned), certainly plead for it. Still, as the political or imperial element is recognized by him in Constantine, the same principle of division would justify the admission of Charlemagne, as a personage fitted to give a name to an era. The present volume extends to the close of the author's Second Period—Constantine, A. D. 311.

In the "Literature of Church History," § 7, a succinct account of writers on ecclesiastical history is given with sufficient fulness, and, perhaps one or two exceptions, with strict impartiality. The author concedes that the *Centuria Magdeburgenses*, that work of stupendous learning and diligence, rendered the highest services; still the praise which he accords, seems to be extorted from him, and the prominence which he gives to its imperfections, from which, as a human production, it is no doubt not free, must make an unfavorable impression respecting it, on his reader's mind, which the distinguished merits of the work by no means justify. Guericke's masterly work, which in twenty-five years passed through eight editions, amid all the success which attended numerous rival works, deserved perhaps a fuller notice than it has here received. In fulness and accuracy of details, in a devout and churchly spirit, and in adaptedness to a student's special wants, that work, which covers the whole ground, still remains without a superior. Dr. Schaff, with great felicity, says that Prof. Shedd's recent publication is a "transfusion," rather than a "translation," doubtless meaning that during the process of commingling Guericke's matter with his own, the best parts of the former were poured aside and lost.

The First Period—the Church under the Apostles, A. D. 1—100—is described in five chapters, pp. 28—141, entitled:

Preparation for Christianity; Founding and growth of the Church; Apostolic theology and literature; Christian life and worship; Organization of the Apostolic Church. From the nature of the case, special facts do not constitute the mass of the matter here presented; general statements, derived from the study of such historic materials as existing records furnish, form the staple of this part. We would specially refer to §§ 12—14, as models of historico-philosophical discussion, and the same remark applies to various other sections. The N. T. isagogic sections, 25—31, do not strictly belong to a professed Church *History*; but our author has interwoven so much purely church-historical matter with them, that no reader would now consent to expunge them. The large amount of foreign matter, exegetical disquisitions, biographical details, &c., which swelled the author's earlier work on the Apostolic Church, and which were inconsistent with the conception of a *History*, while their intrinsic value undoubtedly made them very welcome, are not introduced in the present work. It is true that § 34, on the Spiritual Gifts, assumes altogether an exegetical character; still the *facts*, independently of other considerations, form an element in any historical description of the apostolic church, of such importance that we cannot object positively to this full exhibition of them. The 36th §, on the Several Parts of Worship, if carefully studied, would tend to remove the prevalent opinion that "Preaching" constitutes the main part of *public* worship, and lead many to assign due importance to other constituent parts of the worship of an assembly of believers, namely, the congregational Song, (we would have preferred the word *Hymn*), Confession of Faith, &c. The author's exhibition of the "Church, the Body of Jesus Christ," § 45, is admirable. At this early and pure period, the Church manifested none of the features of modern Congregationalism. Believers in all parts of the Roman Empire seem to have felt that they belonged to one and the same Church—to one widely extended organism, and individual congregations were far from entertaining the disintegrating and enfeebling views of New England Independency.

One or two points are however introduced in this portion of the work, to which we seriously take exception, although our author's views may be sustained by other modern authorities. Some writers are disposed to represent the "speaking with tongues," Acts 2: 4; 1 Cor. ch. 14, *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*, as a difficult

problem, while to others the explanation seems simple and easy. Dr. Schaff, adopting the views of Neander and some others, who are regarded as orthodox, believes that when the apostles spoke "with other tongues," the sense is, not that they spoke in languages *other* than their mother tongue, as even de Wette acknowledges, and as every unbiased reader would believe to be the precise fact intended to be stated by the sacred writers, but something very different. "The Gift of Tongues is," according to our author, p. 60, p. 116, "an utterance proceeding from a state of unconscious ecstasy in the speaker, and unintelligible to the hearer unless interpreted — in a peculiar language inspired by the Holy Ghost. The soul is almost entirely passive, an instrument on which the Holy Spirit plays his heavenly melodies. This gift has, therefore, properly, nothing to do with the spread of the church among foreign people, and in foreign languages, &c., &c." Our author adds to this, on p. 121, that "the speaking with tongues in the apostolic churches, whether song or prayer, was always in the elevated language of enthusiasm." As we observe no traces of *enthusiasm* in Christ or the apostles, in the usual English sense of the word, we should object to its use, if we were not satisfied that the author had in view the admirable but untranslatable German word *Begeisterung*; but we object most decidedly to the general theory itself. We believe, without here attempting to investigate a subject so extensive, that the plain common sense of any reader of the New Testament, can furnish no better explanation, nor, indeed, any amount of theological learning devise a better, than that which belongs to the old orthodox system, according to which the apostles were *so* inspired as to speak fluently in foreign languages, which they had never understood before the day of Pentecost.

In another case, Dr. Schaff appears to us to carry a favorite view of some German theologians to an extreme, when he discriminates so sharply (if we may employ this German idiom) between the Pauline, Petrine and Johannean types of doctrine, as he does in this work. He says, for instance:—"The Catholic church is Jewish-Christian or Petrine in its character; the evangelical [doubtless here a synonym of *Protestant*] is equally Gentile or Pauline," p. 74. The theory is more fully developed in § 23, where "three types of doctrine" are distinguished: "1. The Jewish-Christian type," represented by James, "the apostle of the law," Jude, and pre-eminently Peter, "the apostle of hope." "2. The

Gentile-Christian," represented by Paul, "the apostle of faith." "3. The perfect unity of Jewish and Gentile Christianity," represented by John, "the apostle of love." Unquestionably every sacred writer has his characteristic features—a diversity of temperament, natural talent, educational culture, clearness of vision, &c., appears already in the Old Testament. Abraham, Moses and David were all very differently constituted—Isaiah, Jeremiah, Jonah and Daniel resemble each other almost exclusively in the circumstance that the gift of prophecy was exercised by each of their number. Now the views of Dr. Schaff do not tend, it is true, to impair our confidence in the accuracy or fulness of divine truth of any New Testament book; still, we have never understood the practical value of these distinctions which some authors have found in the modes in which the sacred writers respectively present divine truth, in so far as those modes are determined by their personal peculiarities. We can easily understand the circumstance that even in Christians who have advanced far in the divine life, original constitutional, temperamental and educational differences are not effaced; but in faith, hope and charity, all exhibit a distinct resemblance to the Savior—if, in the latter, they still differ in degree, that difference cannot embarrass us, as long as their example is not *our sole guide*. Paul's mere style differs widely from that of John, his mode of reasoning differs from that of Peter, his choice of topics from that of James—still we find in all the same precious doctrines directly taught or unmistakably presupposed. We cannot admit that they differed even formally in their views of Christian doctrine or duty, or of the relation which the details of these respectively bear to each other, that is, when they professedly teach as inspired writers. The differences which do exist cannot have materially modified the flow of inspiration, if our old-fashioned theory of inspiration is correct, and hence we can regard no theory with favor which implies that "different types of the apostolic doctrine" exist in the New Testament. Our author's views are not clearly unsound, but we do not like the phraseology.

Dr. Schaff's statements respecting the "Lord's day," as distinguished from the Jewish Sabbath, are presented in an admirable manner on p. 118, and p. 128. He is far from denying the duty of the Christian to observe the day, but he exhibits none of those Judaizing tendencies of Puritanism, which time and clearer views of the nature of the Gospel,

have not yet overcome. "So far as we know, the Jewish Christians of the first generation, at least in Palestine, scrupulously observed the Sabbath, the annual Jewish feasts, and the whole Mosaic ritual, and celebrated, in addition to these, the Christian Sunday, &c.," p. 118. Our author does not distinctly say, as the writings of Tertullian, Irenæus, &c., (given by Hengstenberg in his *Tag des Herrn*) would fully justify, that the conception of the Christian Sunday as a mere transfer of the Jewish Sabbath, was unknown to the early Christians; indeed this latter prevalent but inaccurate view is almost endorsed by him, when he remarks: "Thus the Jewish Sabbath passed into the Christian Sunday." p. 119. But he also remarks with strict truth and accuracy, that "the special divine injunction of a weekly Sabbath, which stands in the Decalogue, and is rooted even in the creation, is, in its essence, more than a merely national, temporary and ceremonial law, &c." p. 128. The Puritanical fashion, which may be traced to an affectation of piety, or to false views of the nature of sanctity, of giving the Jewish name to our Christian Holy day, the Lord's, that is, Christ's day, (Rev. 1: 10) receives little countenance from our author. "Sunday was devoted to the commemoration of the Savior's resurrection, and observed as a day of thanksgiving and joy." p. 129. The Christian is placed under more solemn obligations to observe the Lord's day, than those which attached to the Sabbath of the Jews; the reasons are obvious. "The apostolic congregations — from the beginning, held the first day of the week particularly sacred as the "Lord's day," for the thankful celebration of his resurrection, and of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost."—p. 128.

The author's Second Period, extending from A. D. 100 to 311, occupies the larger portion of the volume, and even exceeds the former in interest. An unusually large amount of information is here compressed, which, without including details in every instance, supplies precisely the general matter which the student desires to find. The eight chapters of this part, treat on the following subjects: Spread of Christianity; Persecutions; Literary contests with Judaism and Heathenism; Development of Church doctrine; Christian life; Worship; Organization and Discipline; Church Fathers. We have read with special interest, our author's masterly treatment of one of the most difficult problems of ecclesiastical history—Gnosticism, its origin, character and purposes. His desire to give distinctness to his statements, may have possi-

bly led him to represent Gnosticism too positively as a purely "paganizing heresy," in order to form an antithesis to the opposite Judaizing heresy of Ebionism; he admits, however, that Jewish and Christian ideas were at least often combined with it. Cerinthus and Valentine, for instance, are sufficient, as far as their history is known, to invalidate the theory that Gnosticism is absolutely pagan in its origin. In other respects we have found our author, whose narrative is as strictly original as the nature of the case will admit, unusually successful in combining brevity with fulness of detail. We can scarcely read any modern historian on this intricate subject, without being embarrassed by sudden breaks, by repetitions, and by mere conjectures, mingled undistinguishably with established facts. Dr. Schaff seems to us to have succeeded more fully than any of his predecessors whom we have ever consulted, in presenting a lucid, well-connected and complete account of Gnosticism; he is doubtless the first English writer who has treated the subject with all the aids which history, theological science, philosophy and sound sense can furnish, and satisfied all the reasonable demands of a reader.

If we should attempt to select those portions of this Second Period which seem to us to exhibit in the highest degree, skill, fidelity, distinctness of narrative, tasteful arrangement and comprehensiveness of views, it would be absolutely necessary to specify nearly every chapter. The reader who begins the study of this work for the purpose of learning, will be richly rewarded for the time and attention which he bestows upon it. In place, therefore, of pointing out its excellences in detail, we refer to the whole work itself.

It was occasionally necessary for our author to discuss subjects which are creating a profound interest in our own day, and on which it is almost impossible for an historian to furnish a narrative, without incidentally betraying a personal bias in favor of one or the other of the conflicting parties of modern times. The irritating subject of Slavery is introduced on p. 112 and p. 315. Our author writes here as a faithful historian, an enlightened Christian, and a wise judge. He neither admits, on the one hand, a divine right for slavery in its modern form, nor, on the other, does he, in the fanatical spirit of the Abolitionists, deny the Christian character to a slave-holder. If the sound, practical, moderate views expressed by him, were heartily adopted by the mass of our citizens, the alarming indications furnished by the present state of feeling between the North and the South,

would pass harmlessly away. With regard to the vexed question of Episcopacy, we refer to p. 134 and p. 414. Our historical materials, as far as they are furnished by the New Testament and the earliest ecclesiastical writers, are confessedly insufficient to furnish precise *dates* on the subject, with the exception of the negative evidence derived from the New Testament, that bishops, in the sense of the Church of Rome and Church of England, did *not* exist during the age of the apostles. Dr. Schaff appears to have collected all the materials which are accessible to the modern writer, with the utmost diligence, and examined them with strict fidelity to the truth; he presents the results in §§ 107, 108. He has evidently devoted much time and study to the subject, and we regard this portion of his work as one of the most successful; it deserves to be carefully studied.

The opinions of our author on the Sacraments, will be very closely examined by critics belonging to different schools, and we can only refer to them in general, as additional evidences of his ability to deal with historical materials. We observe, however, with regret, that on several occasions he assents to a generally received but erroneous view, without rigorously weighing, in this particular case, the authorities himself, as he usually does—that is, he admits the validity of immersion as a genuine form of Holy Baptism, and even says that it “expresses the idea of baptism more completely than sprinkling,” (p. 123) thus ignoring the chief purpose for which Baptism was instituted, the impartation of spiritual life, forgiveness of sins, &c. He adduces as evidences, not *historic facts*, nor Scriptural testimony, nor any respectable authority to prove that the “usual form of the act was immersion,” but supports this assumption by Baptist arguments which have been repeatedly proved to be most frivolous, such as, the original meaning of the Greek word *Baptizo*, &c., the “analogy of John’s baptism in the Jordan,” which can only by a total disregard of the language of the evangelists and the circumstances, be twisted into the shape of an immersion, &c.—pp. 123, 385. He himself proves, however, unintentionally, that immersion has no positive evidence for it as a primitive rite, and that it is sustained only by conjectural and conflicting statements, when on p. 398 he loosely says that baptism was performed “with either three successive immersions, or only a single one.” Now it is well known that quite a feud exists between our American immersionist sects, re-

specting the orthodox number of actual dips, while all are alike misled by false views of the subject.

Another opinion, however, of the author, may be mentioned in this connection, which we regard as involving the gravest error that occurs in the whole work. We refer to the following two passages: "Infant Baptism—needs to be completed by a subsequent act like confirmation, &c."—p. 125. "Confirmation was originally closely connected with baptism, as its positive complement, &c."—p. 400. To the latter sentence, as the statement merely of a historic fact, we do not object, although it would possibly have been more precise to say that Confirmation, with its various ceremonies, *was regarded as* completing the act or acts by which baptismal grace was supposed, after the age of the apostles, to be communicated. But the former sentence occurs as a statement of the author's own opinion, which other recent writers have also expressed, since Schleiermacher's authority unfortunately gave it currency. He fully recognizes the scriptural character of Infant Baptism in §§ 37 and 104, as well as the importance of a Christian education after the administration of the rite. But he does not unfold fully the old doctrine of baptismal grace, usually, and perhaps not very happily termed in English: Baptismal regeneration. He says, it is true, that "in theory Christian baptism coincides with regeneration," p. 123, but he does not advance with sufficient fullness the earliest views, which are those now occurring in the doctrinal system of the Lutheran Church. The most explicit remark is the following, on pp. 402, 403: "In the mind of the ancient church, baptism and regeneration were intimately connected, and by Irenæus [born before A. D. 140, and styled on p. 402, "the faithful bearer of Johannean doctrine"] himself, in another passage, they are distinctly identified. In an infant, in fact, any regeneration but through baptism is inconceivable, &c." We may here incidentally remark, that the General Council of Carthage, at a subsequent period (A. D. 418,) which condemned the noxious errors of Pelagius in the most decisive terms, specially noticed his low views of Baptism; if the doctrine of Original Sin is denied, which was one of his heresies, then the baptism of infants is reduced to a mere unmeaning form, as he accordingly taught. Indeed we may ascribe the general indistinctness with which the benefits of Infant Baptism are regarded by many of the men of this generation, and the sinful neglect with which it is treated, even by those who confessionally adopt it, to a

Pelagian feeling which seems to be unconsciously extending in the United States. The council just mentioned, accordingly, while asserting other points of the ancient faith, adopted at the same time a canon which was expressed in unequivocal terms: it disowned Pelagius and all others who, like him, either denied that newly-born children ought to be baptized, or who maintained, on the one hand, that these were indeed baptized for the remission of sins, but, on the other hand, that no original sin, adhering to them from Adam was expiated or removed by the washing (bath, ablution, Titus 3: 5) of regeneration; for, as they added, it would thence follow that no truth was presented by such a baptism, and that it was only an illusory form, or unmeaning ceremony. As our author does not, however, pronounce a decision on the matter, we pass to his other declaration on p. 125, which represents Confirmation as an act supplementary to Baptism. We do not allude to the well-known inconsistency of the Episcopalians, who also mistake the true relation of these two rites to each other, and ignore the important point that the one is of divine origin, and a holy *Sacrament*, the other, in no sense clothed with that exalted character; nevertheless, the Episcopal priest, belonging to an inferior order, is permitted to administer the Sacrament, the other (a rite, the apostolic origin of which is even contested, and which is certainly not a Sacrament,) is reserved for the highest functionary, the Bishop alone. Dr. Schaff seems to regard Baptism as incomplete in itself; we think, on the contrary, that the divine grace which is connected with Baptism is already of a positive nature, and is not given by the Savior in a form so imperfect that it is quite inefficacious without human aid. The early Lutheran Church assigned the highest importance to the *religious education* of baptized children, as the means appointed by the Lord for developing the spiritual life given by the Divine Spirit at its second birth, that is, when it is born of water, regenerated in Holy Baptism. The Church, at the same time, regards a *voluntary and intelligent confession of faith* on the part of the baptized child, at the earliest period, as also a point of the utmost importance. If Dr. Schaff comprehends under the term "Confirmation," as we wish to believe, the religious education of the baptized child, and this subsequent confession of faith, as necessary to the full enjoyment of the benefits of Baptism, his language receives a very satisfactory interpretation, although the precise terms do not readily suggest it. The practice of the Luther-

an Church, in which our modern Confirmation originated, was seriously affected during the horrors of the Thirty Years' War. The devout Spener found the church bleeding at every pore, in consequence of that war, which well nigh extinguished all religious life in the countries that were made desolate by it. He labored long and earnestly in the work of restoring energy to the Church, and, among other measures which he adopted, he was induced to revive the early simple Lutheran rite of Confirmation. He gave it, however, a new form when, on his own authority, and without ecclesiastical sanction, he communicated to it the character of a vow, while originally it was specially a confession of faith. It was now regarded as a confirmation on the part of the individual, of the original baptismal covenant; Spener first required each catechumen to give his hand at the altar, as a pledge that the vow should be kept. This practice of Spener is now, we believe, partially misunderstood among us in the United States, and supposed to be also "the right hand of fellowship"—apparently an improvement even on Spener!

When Pietism was succeeded by Rationalism, the latter, destitute itself of the life-giving power which dwelt in Spener, and denying the cardinal doctrines of the Church, gave an unnatural prominence to the mere external act of Confirmation, that is, the imposition of hands. The hymns, alternately sung by the congregation and the catechumens, the processions, the ostentatious service, intended by its factitious "solemnity," to atone for the absence of spiritual life and a confession of the true faith, the white articles of apparel, the dignified but Christless addresses, the labored efforts to produce an effect—were all more or less introduced by the Rationalists for the purpose of giving a body to Confirmation, after they had renounced the spirit of the Gospel of Christ. In this form, but without the heterodoxy, it may at times be seen in the United States. When the rite of Confirmation is now administered, a much deeper interest is frequently manifested by the congregation than the divine ordinance of Baptism creates. The same persons who were dissolved in tears as they beheld the "young people" approaching the altar, will leave the church without a sign of emotion at the time when a little child is brought to Christ in Holy Baptism, and the regenerating influences of the Divine Spirit are imparted. No doubt the opinion of Dr. Schaff is very prevalent in the Lutheran and German Reformed congregations in the

United States—that is, the opinion which his words may seem to imply. But it is, nevertheless, erroneous in all its aspects, and can only tend to degrade from its true rank a life-giving Sacrament, for which the Church is indebted to its Divine Head. If even we believe that Confirmation is, ultimately, of apostolic origin, and even if we assign to it a very high value, as we sincerely do—that is, when viewed in connection with religious instruction and the subsequent confession of faith—still, as the mere formal act by which new members of a congregation are received, it is as little necessary to complete Baptism, as the agapæ or love-feasts sanctioned by the apostles, were necessary to complete the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

It is a frequent complaint that the English theological literature which our English pastors usually study, is so much tainted with the foreign element of Puritanism, or pervaded by a still more unchurchly spirit. It is, accordingly, a relief to meet with a work like the one before us, the solid learning of which betrays no pretension, and the devout Christian spirit of which is free from formality, from a sickly piety, and from all religious affectation. We were, therefore, the more surprised on meeting with the following sentence on p. 311 : “Against the intoxicating and immoral amusements of the heathen, the Christian life of the early church took the character of an inexorable Puritanic rigor.” Surely that rigor was wisely and properly exercised, as the context indeed implies; as an ethical principle, it is sustained by numerous passages of the New Testament. Was it not then a scriptural, a *Christian* rigor? Why should a moral principle, conscientiously and intelligently applied, and flowing from a divine source, (independently of any anachronistic irregularity in the phrase) be characterized by a term indicating a purely human origin, of doubtful character? Still, we are gratified in the highest degree, to find the work before us entirely free from any tendency to encourage the adoption by the Church of any of those “measures” which modern, and often fanatical, sects have introduced; some of their practices, as well as the theories on which they rest, have unhappily been introduced among those whose fathers had transmitted to them a faith so pure and perfect, and church usages so scriptural and complete, that nothing really useful in doctrine or practice could be further learned from any sect, however loudly it might exclaim against our formality, and require us to adopt its vain human devices.

Two of the excellent features which occur in German works of the class to which the present volume belongs, but which have not hitherto acquired the same prominence in the works of English writers, are here presented, namely, references to "Sources" or original writers from whom the materials are directly or immediately derived, and the "Literature," that is, the principal authors who have written on the special subject discussed, in monographs or otherwise. Dr. Schaff's acquaintance with German, French and English writers, obtained from a study of the works themselves, has enabled him to present a rich array of names, which will be of material service to the student. Although his present position, as he mentions with regret in his Preface, does not give him access to large University libraries, he seems to have fully overcome that disadvantage by his laborious researches; his familiarity with the best productions of the British press, of the present and of earlier times, furnish indubitable evidence of the enlightened zeal and ample success with which he has sought an avenue to every source of knowledge.

We have read the second half of the work with even more pleasure than the first. The style is vigorous and flowing, and reflects the highest credit on the taste and ability of the translator. The following passage is, for instance, so successful in conception and execution, that we cannot forbear to transcribe it:

"Ebionism is a particularistic contraction of the Christian religion; Gnosticism, a vague expansion of it. The one is a gross realism and literalism; the other, a fantastic idealism and spiritualism. In the former the spirit is bound in outward forms; in the latter it revels in licentious freedom. Ebionism makes salvation depend on observance of the law; Gnosticism, on speculative knowledge. Under the influence of Judaistic legalism, Christianity must stiffen and petrify; under the influence of Gnostic speculation it must dissolve into empty notions and fancies. Ebionism denies the divinity of Christ, and sees in the Gospel only a new law; Gnosticism denies the true humanity of the Redeemer, and makes his person and his work a mere phantom, a docetistic illusion.

The two extremes, however, meet; both tendencies from opposite directions reach the same result—the denial of the incarnation, of the true and abiding union of the divine and the human in Christ and his kingdom; and thus they fall together under St. John's criterion of the antichristian spirit of error (1 John 4: 1—3). In both, Christ ceases to be me-

diator and reconciler, and his religion makes no specific advance upon the Jewish and the heathen, which place God and man in abstract dualism, or allow them none but a transient and illusory union."—pp. 211, 212.

The apprehension of the author that "occasional Germanisms" possibly escaped notice, may, no doubt, be safely dismissed. The only one which specially attracted, at least our notice, occurs on p. 478, where a patristic work is said to "fall into three books," from the German *zerfällt*. A few obscurities, perhaps, remain in the earlier part of the volume. On p. 42, the omission of the word "man's" before "original," instead of "the," is an instance. On p. 60, the apostles are "transported into an element." Thus too, on p. 97, the Gospel of John is said to "breathe the peaceful air of eternity." We observed a slight repetition on p. 76 and p. 88, where a sentence referring to Paul, introduces precisely the same consecutive terms. The phrase on p. 170, "Maximus fell again to persecution," resembles an antiquated English construction. The sentence on p. 272, beginning: "All plainly, &c.," of which the grammatical construction is incomplete, may be a typographical oversight. The "aversion" mentioned on p. 332, could not at once have *arisen* as a *prevalent* aversion. These are nearly all the inaccuracies we observed, and they are all of little importance. But we noticed several expressions which are either offensive to good taste, or otherwise inappropriate, and which could easily be altered. They are the following: "Mary, the bride of the Holy Ghost," p. 55; the "blunder" of Peter, p. 77; "the metaphysical discourses of the Lord," and "the evangelists follow their hero," both on p. 97; "the tragedy of the cross," p. 126; "the demigods" mentioned on p. 144; "the Holy Ghost—closely allied to the Father and the Son," p. 278. These occasional lapses are the most serious which we observed, and as they are all more or less susceptible of a good explanation, they furnish the evidence that the body of the work has been prepared with the utmost fidelity, conscientiousness, taste and accuracy.

The work is the most valuable addition which our English theological literature has received for a very long period; it will grace the finest library; it will instruct and charm every intelligent mind; and if the author will proceed in his noble work, on which we sincerely invoke the divine blessing, and should be spared until he has completed it, he will become one of the greatest benefactors known to the friends of learning and truth.

ARTICLE VII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The earnest Christian, Memoirs, Letters, and Journals of Harriet Maria Jukes, wife of the late Rev. Mark R. Jukes. Compiled and edited by Mrs. H. A. Gilbert. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway.—1859.

THIS is one of those delicious christian biographies with not a few of which the religious public has, for some years past, been favored. It is the memoir of one who, in her English home, gave herself in early life to the Lord, resolving to be wholly his, and to make his service her life's one great concern: who, in the happy relations of the home-circle, walked, in strict but cheerful consistency, with God, shedding the light of a bright example around her, and exerting an influence for immeasurable good upon all with whom she associated: who subsequently as governess, then as the wife of a god-fearing and devout emigrant to Canada and settler in that province, continued to maintain that close communion with her Lord, and that godly walk and conversation which had so long characterized her; who afterwards removed to Ohio with her husband, who there entered the sacred ministry in the Episcopal church, in which new relation she continued instant in prayer and in well-doing, and in earnest devotedness to her duties as a member of the church, as a pastor's wife, and as the mother of a numerous family, until after a couple of years, herself and husband were, within two days of each other, swept into the grave by cholera. Her numerous letters, her journal, her entire walk and conversation breathe throughout the most fervent love to the Savior and his people, an earnest desire, ever exhibiting its sincerity in appropriate action, to win souls to Him whom her soul loved, a severe conscientiousness in dealing with herself, a meek, gentle and loving fidelity to all the duties of the christian in life's varied relations, all which renders the book one of the most attractive, interesting, instructive and edifying, which it has been our privilege to recommend to our readers. To young and old we accordingly recommend it as a precious testimony to the power of religion in the soul, and a powerful witness for the beauty and blessedness of holiness.

Christian Hope. By John Angell James. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway.—1859.

It seems quite needless to recommend this volume to the christian public of this country, where the name and works of the author have been so well known for many years, and where his reputation is a sufficient passport for any religious works to the favor of serious and devout readers. In his dedication of the work to his colleague, the Rev. R. W. Dale, the author says: "What I here send forth has, with no considerable variation, been the subject of my ministerial teaching for more than half a century. It exhibits my latest, as well as my earliest, views of the truth as it is in Jesus." With the prospect before him of being removed, at no distant period, from the sphere of his faithful labors on earth to his glorious reward in heaven, this venerable servant of Christ here sends forth his parting words to that world, in which he has been made the blessed instrument of turning many to righteousness. Under a variety of heads he considers the christian grace of hope, discussing its nature, foundation, object, &c., with a clearness of intelligence, varied richness of experience, an earnestness of well instructed and thoroughly disciplined zeal, and a chastened fervor of spirit, such as we can look for only in one who has grown gray in the service of the Master. Without being prepared to adopt every sentiment which it presents, we cannot hesitate to say that the work contains a mine of solid thoughts, of lucid exposition, of devout reflections, of happy christian experiences, of wise counsel and earnest exhortation, and that to all true christians, whether ministers or laymen, it cannot fail to be a faithful monitor, and a most instructive and edifying companion, not only in the secret inquiries and exercises of the closet, but in the pursuits, the struggles and conflicts, and the sacred duties of this probationary state.

Country School-Houses: containing Elevators, Plans and Specifications, with Estimates, Directions to Builders, Suggestions as to School Grounds, Furniture, Apparatus, etc., and a Treatise on School-House Architecture. By James Johonnot, with numerous Designs by S. E. Hewes. New York: Ivison & Phinney, 321 Broadway. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co.—1859.

THIS handsome octavo volume ought, we think, to be a most acceptable acquisition to all who are entrusted with the superintendence and management of public schools in the country. Its specific design is, to benefit the country, in which little attention has been paid to the matters here so efficiently discussed, whilst in the cities and larger towns school-houses have generally been built in a style conformable to the improved

architecture prevailing around them. The importance of having tasteful—handsome or, at least, neat school-houses, duly ventilated, well and judiciously windowed, appropriately furnished, and in pleasant localities, is so obvious, and by intelligent persons so well understood, that it requires no elaborate demonstration. And yet it seems needful to urge it upon the consideration of those, whose duty it is to select sites and to adopt plans for country school-houses. To such persons the work before us will furnish, point for point, in most ample and minute detail, all necessary information. It reduces to system, the great mass of valuable information previously collected, but never connectedly presented, and develops from it principles of universal application. It contains plans specially adapted to the wants of the country districts, with all the details of building, estimates, bills of material and labor, specifications, and full and accurate descriptions, so that any ordinary builder can construct a school-house precisely as described. A few plans of a more elaborate character have also been added. The work is, in every sense of the word, decidedly, intensely practical, free from all idle verbiage. The forms of architecture recommended are illustrated with twenty designs exhibiting a progressive scale of artistic beauty, rising from the most simple compatible with good taste, to the most elegant likely to be adopted in rural districts, and accompanied with all necessary draughts of internal arrangements. We trust the work will find an extensive circulation; we hope it will make its way into every school-district in the country, and gain many readers every where, and we bespeak for its valuable information and its sound principles the careful attention of all school-boards or committees—of all who have any influence in the educational affairs of our land.

Sermons by the Rev. John Caird, M. A., Minister of the Park Church, Glasgow, Author of "Religion in common Life"—A sermon preached before the Queen. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway.—1858.

THE sermon which the author of the discourses before us preached before the Queen, having been republished here by the Carters, has made him extensively known in this country. The present volume contains twelve of his sermons on a considerable variety of subjects, all of the profoundest interest. Although of a decidedly practical character, they are written in a style of great elegance, perhaps too uniformly and perfectly sustained throughout to suit the taste of some readers. And yet they are characterized by great simplicity and directness, the beautiful style appearing to be the garb in which the author's thoughts naturally clothe themselves. There is nothing pedantic, nothing far-fetched about them: there is no clap-trap, no straining after effect. They are the sol-

emphatic and impressive utterances of a serious mind and a devout and earnest spirit upon subjects of the highest moment to man: the fresh and vigorous outpouring of a heart full of the love of Christ and of souls. Thoroughly evangelical in doctrine, rich in profitable applications of sacred truth, clear in exposition and happy in illustration, they present fair models of sermonizing to a large class of minds, offer many happy suggestions to preachers generally, and afford most instructive and edifying reading to christians of all classes.

The Science of common Things ; A familiar explanation of the first Principles of physical Science. For Schools, Families and young Students. Illustrated with numerous Engravings. By David A. Wells, A. M.

Wells' Natural Philosophy ; For the use of Schools, Academies, and Private Students : Introducing the latest Results of Scientific Discovery and Research : arranged with special Reference to the practical Application of Physical Science to the Arts and the Experiences of every day Life, with 375 Engravings. By David A. Wells, A. M., author of "The Science of Common Things," Editor of the "Annual of Scientific Discovery," "Knowledge is Power," &c. Tenth Edition.

Wells' Principles and Applications of Chemistry ; for the use of Academies, High Schools and Colleges : Introducing the latest Results of Scientific Discovery and Research, and arranged with special Reference to the practical Application of Chemistry to the Arts and Employments of Common Life. With 240 Illustrations. By David A. Wells, A. M., author of "Wells' Natural Philosophy:" "Science of Common Things:" Editor of the "Annual of Scientific Discovery," etc. New York: Ivison & Phinney, 321 Broadway. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co., 39 & 41 Lake St. Cincinnati: Moore, Wilstach, Keys & Co. St. Louis: Keith & Woods. Philadelphia: Sower, Barnes & Co. Buffalo: Phinney & Co. Newburg: T. S. Quackenbush.—1858.

WE have linked together, as the heading to a general notice, the three works named above, published or re-issued, during the course of the year, by the same well-known house in New York, and by a number of affiliated establishments elsewhere. Our multiplied engagements forbid our subjecting these works to that minute examination, which would warrant us in guaranteeing their perfect freedom from error. We have found

no errors; and we happen to know that the second work in our list has met with an enthusiastic reception from a great number of instructors and principals of academies, and obtained the warmest encomiums from men eminent for their scientific attainments. While therefore we speak in good company in expressing our own favorable opinion, we need scarcely say that this has not been formed without an extensive examination of the three volumes themselves. If we were disposed to be hypercritical, we might point out some slight inaccuracies of expression or statement; but they are of so little consequence as not to call for specific notice. We admire in these books, in the first place, their simple arrangement, and the direct continuity of development with which their respective subjects are presented. The subjects treated in the work first named above belong both to Physics and to Chemistry: they are presented and explained in a succession of Questions and Answers, and illustrated with many engravings. The great merit of this book consists in its freedom from mere technicalities, its plainness of language, and its eminently practical character, which qualities will render it a most welcome and useful instructor to ordinary readers, not possessed of scientific knowledge, or able to pursue scientific studies, and yet also well adapted to prepare such persons for the successful prosecution of more strictly scientific research. It is a work which ought to be in the hands of all who would pass for ordinarily intelligent members of society. So far as our acquaintance with text-books in Natural Philosophy extends, and it is not very limited—we are free to say that we regard the one before us as by far the best that we have seen. It is much more copious in matters, more full in explanation and illustration, than any other that we have met with. The facts to be communicated, the doctrines and principles to be inculcated, are stated with great simplicity, clearness and precision, and so amply unfolded and elucidated, that it must require great obtuseness of intellect not to comprehend the instruction thus given. The same is true of the work on chemistry, both as to the general arrangement, and to the execution in detail. Facts and doctrines are every where stated in terse, comprehensive and clear propositions, which are then further commented upon, unfolded, explained, illustrated, or enriched with other important but kindred matter, in smaller type, and the reader or student is carried along on a smooth but briskly flowing tide of vivid and lucid exposition, into the very heart of the most interesting sciences, and to a familiarity with all the rich and fully established results of the most recent researches in their respective domains. The author has effectually defended himself against the gratuitous attack recently made upon his *Natural Philosophy* in a popular monthly, and shown how the errors charged upon *him* accidentally crept into the earlier editions of his work.

We most cordially recommend the three works before us to instructors in academies and schools, to parents who would aid their children in the

acquisition of useful knowledge, and to those who are obliged to contend with the difficulties, and desire to master the mysteries of Natural Science, without the aid of teachers or professors.

A Golden Treasury for the Children of God, whose Treasure is in Heaven: consisting of Select Texts of the Holy Scriptures, with practical observations in prose and verse for every day in the year. By C. H. Von Bogatzky. Translated from the German for the Lutheran Board of Publication. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication, 732 Arch Street.

This work has been long known and valued by Christians. In the original it has had a high reputation, and been blessed to the good of many souls. We hail with great pleasure the appearance of the present edition, presented in so attractive a form by our Lutheran Board of Publication, and free from the mutilations which have characterized other editions of the work issued in an English dress. The book is worthy of a place in every dwelling, and we sincerely trust its circulation may be as wide as its merits are deserving. Our pastors would do much towards promoting a devotional spirit among their people, by recommending its introduction and daily perusal in every family of their charge.

Smith & English have published Dr. Fairbairns' Hermeneutical work, which we recommended in a former number. It can be procured now from them.

The state of the impenitent Dead by Dr. Hovey, published by Gould & Lincoln is a very interesting discussion of an important subject, called for by the efforts of Universalism, in various forms, to propagate itself.

The New England Theocracy by H. F. Wheden, translated by H. C. Conant and published by the same house, we have read with much interest, and as a history of Congregationalism in New England, it is very instructive.

Lindsay & Blakiston have brought out the 8th number of the translation of Dr. Herzog's Encyclopedia of Theology. It seems to be growing in favour.

Hengstenberg's able work in the prophecies in the new Edition has been completed in 4 vols., and can be had of Smith & English, Philadelphia.

Smith & English will publish an edition of Winer's New Testament Grammar, last edition, translated—first vol. on hand—a Classic.

Notices of several interesting books omitted for want of space.

INDEX TO VOL. X.

- Africa, Travels in, 130
 American Educational Year-Book, 310
 American Pulpit, 168
 Analytical Bibliography of the Augsburg Confession, 16
 Baccalaureates, 100, 291, 381
 Baptism of Children, 347
 Baptist system examined, 307
 Bayne's Essays, 160
 Bishop, a teacher, 311
 Butler's Ancient Philosophy, 159
 Butler, Rev. J. G., memoir of, 564
 Christ preaching to the Spirits in Prison, 74
 Christian Hope, 602
 Church, Lutheran, 11
 Church History, Manual of, 146
 Church History, Schaff's, 586
 Country School-Houses, 602
 Dogmatic of Lutheran Church, 214, 579
 Earnest Christian, 601
 Educational efforts of the Penna. Synod, 269, 506
 Evangelical Rambler, 459
 Family to the church, 360
 Flohr, Rev. G. D., memoir of, 573
 Golden Treasury, 606
 Gray's Botany, 155
 Griswold on social prayer, 160
 Guericke's Church History, 146
 Hackett's Commentary on Acts, 157
 Harris' Sermons, 159
 Henkel, Rev. C., memoir of, 392
 Hermeneutical Manual, 301
 Heydenreich's German Reader, 157
 John the Constant, 30, 461
 Krauth, Rev. Dr., 11, 100, 291, 381
 Lasar, Rev. H. S. Art. by, 105, 232
 Lehmann, Prof., Art. by, 400
 Liturgical Studies, 105, 232
 Livingstone's Travels in Africa, 130
 Lochman, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 322
 Manual of Church History, 146
 Mayer, Rev. Dr., memoir of, 190
 Mediatorial character of Jesus, 506
 Meteorology, 161
 Missionary Institute, 332
 Muhlenberg, Prof. F. A., Art. by, 269, 506
 New York Pulpit, 368
 Notices of New Publications, 152, 306, 455, 601
 Olshausen's Commentary, 124
 Oswald, Rev. J., Art. by, 347
 Quitman, Rev. Dr., memoir of, 183
 Reed on the American Union, 159
 Relation of family to church, 360
 Reminiscences of deceased Lutheran ministers, 183, 386, 564
 Review, Evangelical, Sabbath, 322
 Saxon Electors, 36, 461
 Schaeffer, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 36, 461
 Schaff's Church History, 586
 Schmidt, Prof. W., memoir of, 386
 Science with regard to the Primitive world, 400
 Science of common things, 604
 Seiss' Baptist System, 307
 Select Discourses of Krummacher and others, 308
 Sermons by Rev. John Caird, 603
 Sheepfold and the Common, 459
 Spirit, testimony of the, 296
 Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit, 157
 Spurgeon's Discourses, 308
 Stoecker, Prof. M. L., Art. by, 74, 183, 296, 386, 564
 Ticknor's Constitution of the United States, 158
 Tholuck's Commentary, 152
 Tholuck on the primitive world 400
 Ulman's sinfulness of Jesus, 367

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Valentine, Rev. M., Art. by, 360 | Wisdom and benevolence of God |
| Voice of Christian life in song, 155 | illustrated from Meteorology, 161 |
| Weiser, Prof. R., Art. by, 80, 332 | Year Book, 510 |
| Wells' series, 604 | Zwingli, 306 |

82